

The Modern Language Journal

Volume XLIII

APRIL, 1959

Number 4

Contents

ROBERT HERNDON FIFE (1871-1958)	161
THE CRUCIAL IMPORTANCE OF THE HUMANITIES IN A SCIENCE-DOMINATED WORLD, <i>Earl J. McGrath</i>	162
HOW FAR HAVE THE MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES PROGRESSED SINCE WORLD WAR II, <i>Coleman, Twaddell, Hocking, Yakobson</i>	167 ↵
THE LIMITATIONS OF PSYCHOLINGUISTICS, <i>Ernest Stowell</i>	171
ON LANGUAGE AND CULTURE, <i>Dalai Brener</i>	175
THE FUNCTION OF THE WRITTEN EXERCISE IN THE LANGUAGE CLASS HOUR, <i>Walter Meiden</i>	178 ↵
INTENSIVE METHOD TECHNIQUES FOR INTERMEDIATE COURSES, <i>Mastronie, Bickley</i>	181 ↵
EXPERIMENT IN THE TEACHING OF RUSSIAN IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, <i>Calandra, McClain</i>	183
AUDING TESTS, <i>Theodore Mueller</i>	185
ART, TRUTH, MORALITY AND THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY FRENCH NOVEL, <i>Gershman, Whitworth</i>	188
SLAVISTICS AND WORLD LITERATURE, <i>Folejewski</i>	194
WHAT HAPPENED TO COLERIDGE'S WALLENSTEIN, <i>Morgan</i>	195
NOTES AND NEWS	202
BOOK REVIEWS	204

(An index for the periodical year is published annually. From its inception in 1929, *The Educational Index* covers the subject-matter of the MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL.)

Published by

The National Federation of Modern
Language Teachers Associations

The Modern Language Journal

STAFF, 1959

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

(*Former Managing Editors*)

BAYARD QUINCY MORGAN, Stanford University, California (1926-30).

CHARLES H. HOLZWARTH, University of Texas, Austin, Texas (1930-34).

HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE, The George Washington University, Washington, D. C. (1934-38).

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio (1938-43).

HENRI C. OLINGER, New York University, New York, N. Y. (1944-46).

JULIO DEL TORO, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis. (1948-54).

CAMILLO P. MERLINO, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts (1954-58).

MANAGING EDITOR

J. ALAN PFEFFER, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York

ASSISTANT TO THE MANAGING EDITOR

HELEN W. BURRELL, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York

ASSISTANT MANAGING EDITORS

(*Review and Department Editors*)

AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS—José Sánchez, University of Illinois, Chicago, Ill.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—Stephen L. Pitcher, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Mo.

FRENCH—Cameron C. Gullette, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

GERMAN—Karl-Heinz Planitz, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana

HEBREW—Abraham I. Katsh, New York University, New York, N. Y.

ITALIAN—Anthony J. DeVito, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

LINGUISTICS—Mario Pei, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

METHODOLOGY—Evelyn Van Eenenaam, Redford High School, Detroit, Mich.

PERSONALIA—William Marion Miller, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

PORTUGUESE—Benjamin M. Woodbridge, Jr., University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

SLAVIC—Jacob Ornstein, Graduate School, Dept. of Agr., Washington, D. C.

SPANISH AND SPANISH AMERICAN—Julio del Toro, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.

(*Survey Editors*)

FRENCH—Cortland Eyer, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

GERMAN—Victor Lange, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

ITALIAN—O. A. Bontempo, College of the City of New York.

PORTUGUESE—Gerald Moser, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

SPANISH AND SPANISH AMERICAN—Julio del Toro, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.

SLAVIC—Peter Rudy, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

BUSINESS MANAGER

STEPHEN L. PITCHER, 7144 Washington Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

NOTE—The printed order of articles does not imply relative merit. Opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the editorial staff. The interest and the cooperation of all *Journal* contributors are appreciated.

All contributions should conform to the directions contained in the *MLA Style Sheet*. Unacceptable manuscripts accompanied by postage will be returned.

Robert Herndon Fife (1871-1958)

WITH the death of Robert Herndon Fife on August 1, 1958 the world of scholarship lost one of its most distinguished and most highly respected members. With his sound judgement Professor Fife was admirably equipped to succeed Calvin Thomas as chairman of the department of Germanic Languages at Columbia. Professor Fife was a man of great energy, yet at all times considerate and courteous in his actions. He saw his aims clearly and pursued them with steady determination and with great inborn tact. As a scholar he moved in the company of the most eminent men in this country and in Europe. His range of knowledge was encyclopedic, his method conservatively sound. The passing years, far from narrowing his point of view, left him receptive to new ideas and increased his readiness to support enthusiastically research projects of his colleagues and his many doctoral candidates in fields of research beyond which most scholars of his generation never ventured.

Professor Fife devoted himself with unequalled singlemindedness to the service of his profession. While carrying a heavy administrative burden at Columbia University, serving on many committees, and guiding doctoral dissertations with great sensitivity and the most painstaking attention to detail, he was able to write policy-making works on the methods of modern language instruction. In 1924 Fife was commissioned by the American Council on Education to conduct a survey of modern language instruction in the United States. His *Summary of Reports on the Modern Foreign Languages*, published in 1931, constitutes one of the landmarks in the history of modern language teaching in this country. After the completion of the study the Council requested Fife to continue his supervision of additional publications as chairman of the Committee on Modern Languages. In 1929 Columbia University conferred on him the honorary degree of Litt.D. He was also elected to honorary membership in the *Deutsche Philologen Gesellschaft*, and he became an honorary corresponding member of the *Deutsche Akademie* in

Munich. In 1944 he served as President of the Modern Language Association of America.

In 1926 Professor Fife founded the *Germanic Review* of which he remained the chief editor until his retirement in 1946. Even today the *Review* is the sole journal in the United States devoted exclusively to study and research in the field of Germanic Literature and Philology.

With all his teaching and administrative load Professor Fife found considerable time for independent research. He published learned articles on Jean Paul and on the Romantic *Märchen* and edited scholarly text books for college use. In 1916 the Macmillan Company published his *Germany between Two Wars*, which gives a singularly objective presentation of the political, social and cultural background of Imperial Germany. In 1937 he collaborated in the edition of a large collection of *Letters by Ludwig Tieck* and for the Hroswitha Club he wrote a charming, yet authoritative sketch of the great nun of Gandersheim. His monumental book, *The Revolt of Martin Luther*, representing the research of approximately 30 years, was published by the Columbia University Press in 1957 and justly acclaimed as one of the most perceptive pieces of research to come from the pen of an American Germanist.

Professor Fife carried his responsibilities with singularly good grace. One was always aware of the human qualities of this outstanding man. Never pompous, ever helpful and considerate, Professor Fife will be gratefully remembered by his many students as the decisive influence not only in their professional life but in their personal development as well. In him they came to know and admire that rare type of person—the true gentleman-scholar. His memory is certain to live long among his colleagues, his personality and work are certain to remain a source of inspiration for generations to come.

ANDRÉ VON GRONICKA
FREDERICK W. J. HEUSER
CARL F. BAYERSCHMIDT

Columbia University

*The Crucial Importance of the Humanities in a Science-Dominated World**

THE phrase science-dominated world may be unfortunate. To speak of ours as a science-centered culture is really more accurate. It is true that considered either as a set of intellectual procedures for analyzing reality, or as the substantive body of fact and principle which these procedures produce, science has come to play an increasingly prominent part in Western society. Yet, other cultural institutions such as religion, education, and the humanities themselves have also played important parts. Moreover, in estimating the impact of science on contemporary society a distinction sometimes obscured should be kept clearly in mind, namely the difference between science and technology.

There is no question of the dominance, not to say tyranny, of technology over our very existence today. Our dependence on technology is most obvious in our helplessness and frustration when its products fail and we are incapable any longer to find alternative devices by our mere hands and minds. We are dominated by the products of technology. We rise in the morning at the sound of an alarm clock radio; we shave with an electric razor; sitting at the breakfast table, we percolate our coffee, toast our bread, and fry our eggs on electrical devices without rising. We still have no mechanical device for kissing our wives good-bye, but we jump into the piece of machinery which carries us to work; there, after the elevator operator's count down, we are shot up to the fortieth floor in something like a first stage rocket—and so on through the day, using electric lights, typewriters, adding machines; and we at last go to bed to sleep under an electric blanket. That we are in fact in bondage to technology is evident.

The reason for semi-facetiously enumerating these artifacts of *Homo Americanus* of 1958 is, however, not primarily to prove this dominance, but rather to indicate that these aspects of our culture represent science in the minds of many of our citizens. This is an unfortunate miscon-

ception and education has a responsibility to replace this view with one that more validly represents what science really is and does. For until the people generally have a clearer conception of the scientific enterprise as a set of intellectual tools, as a way of examining the world, as a philosophy of life if you please, one can hardly speak of a science-dominated world. Many of our citizens are innocent of most of even the major facts and generalizations of science, and more significantly they are unacquainted with its methods and the uses to which they can be put. It could fairly be added that some of these persons are college graduates who may have had instruction in science.

Because of the importance of science in contemporary life and the widespread misunderstanding of its real character, it is fitting that the topic under discussion should include reference to both science and the humanities. To introduce the main body of the discussion I would advance the idea that the sciences ought to be included as fully accredited members of that family of subjects we describe as "liberal education." It has been troubling to an outsider, and doubtless vexing to scientists, to observe that in the vigorous discussions of recent months regarding what should be taught in the schools and colleges of our nation many persons, including educators, speak of "liberal education" and "science education" as though these were mutually exclusive terms. Those who make such a disjunction of subject matter should recall that of the original seven liberal arts, which reigned in the intellectual world almost unchallenged for many centuries, three—astronomy, geometry, and arithmetic—had a scientific character.

We ought to reject any notion that science is not an essential part of liberal education. If

* Address of the Honorary President, delivered at the Annual 1958 Meeting of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations.

properly taught it is an ideal means for cultivating many of the qualities of mind and heart which we have traditionally considered the benefits of a liberal education. Are not the intellectual skills, the compelling search for truth, the eagerness for new knowledge, and the humble spirit in the face of the vast unknown, all outcomes of education in any truly liberal discipline? And are not these qualities among the objectives in any proper course in science? It is important to think of science as an essential element in the liberal education of all citizens, whether they are to become scientists, diplomats, engineers, preachers, or artists. What I am suggesting is that we consider instruction in science not as something tacked on to a liberal education, but as an essential element in humane learning. Professor Gerald Holton of Harvard University deplores the cavalier attitude of those in other fields toward science when he says that,

The . . . separation between science and other pursuits, which entails putting science not only in a separate but in an inferior category, . . . leads to the idea that science has nothing to do with culture except in the most indirect way, and sees scientists more or less in the role of electronic button-pushers, as necessary perhaps as plumbers and garage mechanics.

The damage done by this withdrawal of the humanists from the most elementary understanding of science has been incalculable not only to science, but quite as much to the effectiveness of the humanistic society itself.

How instruction in science is to be given its proper place in a rounded liberal education is a matter of obvious concern to those who teach in the humanities. Courses will doubtless differ in purpose, content, arrangement and method, as they should. But one reason why science has not been adequately considered a part of liberal education is that scientists have not been aware of the pressing need for instruction for those who do not intend to make a life work of science. Emphasis for them should be on the history of ideas, the philosophical basis of science, and its impact on social structures and practices. Such instruction would reveal science as an imaginative creation of the human mind and give evidence of its enduring search for understanding and truth. Instruction of this type should surely gain the support of others, teachers of humanities, for example, who, using somewhat different material, yet seek some of the same ends.

If the time spent in this paper on the subject of science as a humane discipline seems inordinately long, it is so because I wished to establish the idea of a balanced liberal education for all. Alfred North Whitehead, speaking over thirty years ago of the professionalization and the specialization of learning, and the consequent imbalance in the education of the young, said:

. . . the novel pace of progress requires a greater force of direction if disasters are to be avoided. The point is that the discoveries of the nineteenth century were in the direction of professionalism, so that we are left with no expansion of wisdom and with greater need of it.

Wisdom is the fruit of a balanced development. It is this balanced growth of individuality which it should be the aim of education to secure. The most useful discoveries for the immediate future would concern the furtherance of this aim without detriment to the necessary intellectual professionalism.*

The humanities have much to contribute in restoring the balance which in Whitehead's words, "It should be the aim of education to secure." As a consequence of attention to the humanities, perhaps a larger number of the members of our own and future generations would possess the wisdom he seeks.

What then can be the special contributions of the humanistic disciplines to these ends? What must be the position and status of the humanities in the academic world if these ultimates of wise living are to be achieved? Examining this latter question historically for a moment, no thoughtful person can expect to witness the restoration of the humanities, the ancient and modern languages and literature, philosophy, history and the arts to the regnant position they occupied in education for a millennium. The hierarchy of learning of the nineteenth-century college, presided over by Greek and Latin and their retinue of supporting subjects, like the stratified feudal society of an earlier day, has been superseded by a democratic commonwealth of subject matters. As one of the studies recently issued by the Institute of Higher Education shows, the three or four departments of language, literature, philosophy, and mathematics, of 1875, have now multiplied not only into such academic subjects as history,

* Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 284.

psychology, and economics, but also nearly as many in some institutions in accounting, medical technology, and agriculture. The history of the high school and the college curriculum in the United States strongly suggests that this latter family of subjects is bound to grow through the years. Under the circumstances, the humanities will find themselves vying with other subjects for the limited time of students.

But, in the preservation of a proper balance in American education, the humanities will have an important part to play. Indeed it is no exaggeration to say that only to the extent that this and future generations of youth absorb the wisdom of the ages and master the intellectual skills represented in the humanistic disciplines, can the great advances made in the social and natural sciences be used in the creation of a better, a fuller, and a more dignified life for all mankind. For the humanities are concerned with ends, with ultimate purposes, with the norms of human existence. While not disregarding or scorning the facts of the sciences (in a limited sense more precise), the humanities reach far beyond into the realm of emotion and spirit; and, more importantly, they deal with human feelings, aspirations, and ideals, matters which do not yet lend themselves to the cold analysis of some of the other disciplines. The position of the humanities in the educational system of a democratic society must be secure. No student who has had the privilege of a high school and college education in America can be said to have had a complete, a rounded, a liberal education, unless this education has brought him in touch with the studies included in the humanities. It is our responsibility as educators, regardless of our special academic pursuits, to work toward the objective of providing such an education for all.

There is, in fact, encouraging evidence that many of the leading scientists are firm in the conviction that the humanistic studies shall not be crowded out of the schools and colleges by larger and larger proportions of science and mathematics. Dr. James B. Conant, a chemist of repute prior to entering public life, and currently pursuing a study of the comprehensive high school, holds the view, for instance, that all college-bound youth should have at least four years of English and four years of a foreign lan-

guage. To the unreflecting and the self-interested there seems to be a justification for the predominance of science. They defend the imbalance in the curriculum by pointing to the sheer need of survival in this conflicted world. The prior question in any discussion of personal or national survival is, however, the question which concerns the humanities. What kind of a life do we wish to preserve?

What are the values the humanities seek to create and preserve? A list of these would be too long fully to enumerate here. It would include acquainting the student with the best that has been said and written through the ages; through this process cultivating standards of taste and of conduct in relation to literature, art and life; assisting the student in at least tentatively formulating a reasoned and steady philosophy of life; cultivating the processes of communication in his own and other tongues to the end that he can formulate his own ideas, express them clearly, and understand the thoughts of others; gaining for him an understanding of the free institutions of the Western world; and nurturing the willingness to defend these institutions, if necessary, to the death. About each of these ends of education many books have been written. One of the advantages of having studied the humanities is that one would feel free, indeed impelled, to give his own interpretation to these and the other ends of humane learning, and to supply his own educational content and method by which they should be achieved.

One special value in the study of the humanities may, however, now justifiably occupy the attention of all those concerned with American education. It seems to me it is in this respect that the humanities differ to a perceptible degree from the other scholarly disciplines. Perhaps the idea can best be expressed in the statement that the study of the humanities ideally should prepare, and accustom, the individual to make decisions where no final or generally acceptable decisions are possible. To be sure, like their sister disciplines, when properly taught, they inculcate the habit of analytical consideration of existing fact, and the practice of sustained and objective reasoning. But the humanities also nurture the habit of making a decision and acting upon it even when few precise

facts are available. Unfortunately, in many of life's most complex situations the full facts, or even any very decisive evidence, are unobtainable. Yet, mankind is still required to act in regard to the most important human problems with decisiveness, but unhappily without omniscience. The fate of an individual or a whole nation, or indeed perhaps now, the whole human community, may be at stake in such a decision.

Perhaps this problem which men have faced through the ages can be illustrated most dramatically by a decision which a president of the United States once had to make, and act on, in regard to a matter of unimaginable import. He had singly to decide whether or not to drop a bomb which would destroy the lives, the homes, the hopes, the destinies of thousands of human beings. The strong, the weak; the sick, the well; the good, the bad; the cruel, the compassionate; —all would be wiped off the face of the earth with one giant blast of atomic fire. Was there in this instance any source where final decisive knowledge could be found to resolve the fateful issues inherent in such a decision? Of course not! Scientists could calculate the force and range of the blast; intelligence agents could estimate the number of persons imperilled; military experts could forecast the probable damage to the enemy and the saving of American lives; moralists and clergymen could advise on the ethical issues involved; political scientists could try to predict the consequences in terms of world opinion and our future position as a leader of the free people; his own special core of advisers could render an overall judgment. These, and a host of other sources of information were available and doubtless used. But, at the last, weighing all the factors concerned in this enormously complicated human situation, one mind, one will, one man, had to combine all the elements, weigh them, and wring from them a decision which would profoundly affect, if not redirect, the destiny of mankind.

This example could be duplicated on much lower levels of complexity, responsibility, and consequences in thousands of decisions in which each of us is of necessity engaged every day of our lives. Essentially they employ the same processes of discriminating reasoning, the same weighing of facts and fates, the same capacities for relational thinking, the same dedication to

ideals and values, the same understanding of the nature of God and of man. If the humanities can instill the idea that many patterns of conviction, of life, of love, of the government of men, have engaged the most able minds of all time, that though no final answers to their questions have been found, great wisdom has been accumulated and that each human being has a moral responsibility to face these questions, to think seriously about them, and to act with integrity and resoluteness with regard to them, —they, the humanities, will have justified their being. Cultivating the habit of reflection and exercise of discriminative judgment about the continuing problems of man in this complex universe seem to me to be the prime objective of humane learning.

There are two matters in regard to the attitudes of academic people toward the humanities that deserve consideration. One concerns those who teach the sciences, the other, those who teach the humanities. With regard to the first of these we have just observed that many of life's most important decisions must be based on limited evidence. Yet many scientists by their failure to recognize or to accept the view that many of life's decisions cannot be made on the same basis of certitude as that involved in laboratory procedures, cultivate a disdain of the humanities among their students. Perhaps this attitude can be illustrated by an experience I had this past year with a mathematical physicist in a well known state university. I was interviewing this able scientist on an engineering faculty about the value of courses in the humanities pursued by engineering students in that institution. He said in a cool but firm voice that he thought they had little value. When asked to be a bit more concrete, he said they had no substance. Pressed further, he said all they did in the English literature courses was to take a work like *Othello* and talk aimlessly about the place of jealousy in human affairs, and he couldn't see how a subject as insubstantial as that could be of any real value in the daily lives of ordinary working people. Then he added, "After all, people have been talking about such subjects for a thousand years with little result."

This may be an extreme example, but it represents a not uncommon point of view. Teachers of humanities will, of course, deal with this

attitude when it arises in their own classes, but their work would be greatly helped and enhanced, if scientists had a better grasp of the purposes of instruction in these fields, and spoke favorably about courses which often are looked upon with doubt or disfavor among practically minded youth from families of little money or learning.

My other point concerns the humanists themselves. Too often much of their instruction has been academic, vapid and unrelated to the lives and the interests of ordinary human beings. In part this condition stems from the indiscriminate application a century ago of scientific methods of scholarship in the fields of language, literature, philosophy, and history. This influence primarily of German scholarship on undergraduate teaching during the past hundred years has been pernicious. The preoccupation of teachers with philology and linguistics (all right in their proper place), the painful dissection of the great works of literature already made lifeless by an arid pedantry took them far away from the earlier study of the classics as books to be read because they had something important to say to all people at all times. This attitude and its results can best be portrayed by reference to the great scholar Wilamowitz, who, though he taught in a university where many secondary school teachers were trained, said that classical scholarship was so advanced and specialized a branch of learning that it could no longer be regarded as a means of practical humanist education.*

I believe it could be shown that the decline of the ancient languages was in part a result of a shift in interest among the teachers of those subjects from the teaching of great literature to a concern with philology, linguistics, and comparative literature.

In any event, much has happened in American education in the past quarter century to restore the teaching of undergraduates to a dignified level and to revitalize the instruction they receive by considering the great works of literature, history, and philosophy as expressions of ideas which have relevance to their lives. Much more needs to be done to assure that research activities, and the teaching of highly specialized courses, to a handful of advanced students do not so excessively engage the time and energy

of the teachers of the humanities as to impair their teaching of undergraduates. In this connection there is a great myth abroad that these students have no interest in any serious literature which is more difficult to read than the comic strips. Research done for the Fund for Adult Education in the Los Angeles area of young adults, and the experience of faculty members who have taught the "Great Books" elsewhere, provides conclusive evidence that when properly taught these books continue to attract the vital interest of students.

I hope I have been able to show that the humanities have a vital service to perform in the balance of American education. Only as people are concerned with humanistic learning can we attain the fullness of thought, the clarity of vision, and the strength of dedication necessary to meet the problems and issues of contemporary life.

The gravity of these large concerns brings us back to the questions of balance in education and the domination of technology. It is fitting that the New Federal Education bill joins the sciences and at least one branch of the humanities, the languages. I hope the other disciplines, literature, history, philosophy, will also be brought under the terms of this legislation in a future session of Congress. No one today can hope without knowledge of both the humanities and sciences to establish the harmonious view of life necessary to discover a rational and a moral course of action. Together they form a supporting scheme of understanding, the one bringing man into right relations with his physical universe, the other bringing man into right relations with himself and his fellow human beings. Together they can safeguard against the indiscriminating materialism described at the beginning of this paper. Together they provide the substance for making the critical decisions of our times. The teachers of foreign languages have much to contribute to the reconciliation of the important ends of both types of instruction and consequently to the enrichment and the vitalizing of contemporary life.

EARL J. MCGRATH

*Institute of Higher Education
Teachers College, Columbia University*

* See Frederic Lilge, *The Abuse of Learning* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948), p. 107.

How Far Have the Modern Foreign Languages Progressed Since World War II*

I. Fits and Starts

... The covered wagons on our western plains cut out, as it were, the light of the richness of foreign cultures from our incipient American culture, although it is an historic fact that literally hundreds of foreign lands were represented among those who struggled toward our last land frontier at the Golden Gate.

World War I helped but little as our school administrators, in response to the current popular hysteria, practically closed out the study of German. . . . Fortunately our worsening differences with the Soviet Union as they developed during World War II brought no such "Know-

nothing" reactions against the languages of our adversaries as in the case of German in World War I. Rather, interest in Russian increased at least tenfold during World War II. I myself recall how, just *four*, *FOUR*, of us attended the meeting of the Slavic Group of the Modern Language Association in Philadelphia, in 1934. In fact the genial Secretary of M.L.A. of the day, Percy Long, threatened us with what might be called "liquidation" if our numbers did not rapidly increase. . . .

ARTHUR P. COLEMAN, *President
Alliance College*

II. An "Exotic" Task

... The period between 1940 and 1945 was a time of sudden expansion in the scope of our knowledge of languages outside the European sphere. First there was the Intensive Language Program of the ACLS, under a Rockefeller grant, to train American specialists in a wide variety of languages and prepare teaching materials in them. This undertaking was just barely in time to get partly ready for the wartime demands for full-time, short-term study of many of the "unusual" languages, with quickly-prepared materials and with audio aids which were, for their time, modern. The product of this 1940-45 period was a small group of American specialists in various languages, and some teaching materials adapted to the special requirements of the war emergency.

The period 1945-58 has seen three kinds of progress, of varying extents:

(1) There has been some increase in scope. Some languages have been added to the list of those in which Americans are competent.

(2) There has been a great increase in the extent of understanding of the languages. The

analyses are now much more thorough and solidly based. For some of the languages, there are now workers in scholarly research, and the body of research material is constantly growing.

(3) There has been some continuation of work in preparing teaching materials. But even today there are very few of the "unusual" languages with a minimum array of satisfactory teaching materials, as we now understand that minimum, namely introductory texts for oral practice, a set of graded readers, a student's dictionary.

1959 opens a new era, thanks to the National Defense Act of 1958. For some of the "unusual" languages, more analytical work is needed; in some cases, more extensive research on partly-analyzed languages; in other cases involving languages which have become official in new states, it may be necessary to start almost from scratch. In this sense, 1959 marks another phase of increase in scope.

* Excerpts from a *Symposium*, sponsored by the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, December 31, 1958.

In almost all of the "unusual languages" the immediate urgent need is for teaching materials for intensive short-term courses, since the number of experts in other fields who have specific technological, diplomatic, or education assignments overseas but lack the language competence is great. Parallel to this crash program in designing practical courses, there must be long-range provision for a continuing supply of experts in language and area fields, to maintain the research and design the courses and adapt earlier courses and staff the teaching programs themselves.

In the practical phases, the specialists in the various "unusual" languages will need the intelligent collaboration of experienced language

teachers. Theoretical analysis is indispensable, but is not enough; the teachers and textbook writers in the familiar languages have the unique contribution to make which comes from personal contact with teaching problems and from participation in the time-tested tradition of language-teaching. Both sides will have to study; the analyst must learn about the classroom, and the experienced teacher must learn about language structure. Each will have to acquire some new vocabulary and some new syntax. . . .

The tasks of the 1960s will require a lot of hard work. But those tasks can be done.

W. F. TWADDELL

Brown University

III. Teacher or Machine

... By now it is abundantly demonstrated that the language laboratory can make valuable contributions to foreign language teaching, especially at the elementary level. There is good reason to believe that it can provide a valid way to "multiply the good teacher" and thus help to provide foreign language instruction to students who might otherwise be

denied such instruction because of the impending shortage of teachers. Serious and well documented experimentation in this and other uses of the language laboratory should be the next step.

ELTON HOCKING

Purdue University

IV. The Russian Surge

... In various surveys of the history of Slavic studies in the United States, one finds much interesting information about the pioneering work of the first American Slavicists—such people as Wiener and Gross at Harvard and G. R. Noyes at California. One also learns that Czech was taught at Oberlin in 1885 and that centers of Slavic studies had developed in some parts of the country where there was a preponderance of Americans of Slavic origin. Among them, Alliance College stands out. It was founded in Pennsylvania by the National Polish Foundation in 1912 and its present distinguished President has contributed much to the development of Slavic studies in this country. . . .

But despite these brave beginnings and the devoted and inspired teachings of a few isolated Slavic scholars, by 1935, according to one survey, there were only six Slavic departments

in all American colleges and universities. When in the 1920's Charles Bohlen and George Kennan, our great Russian specialists, needed to get their training, they were sent to Paris and London to get it!

... The development of Slavic studies was always at the mercy of sporadic financial support and was made much too dependent on the vacillations of our political relationships with the Soviet Union and East European countries.

The second World War brought an urgent demand for Slavic language specialists to serve our government. This demand could hardly be met in view of the past history of Slavic studies. The immediate task of preparing specialists in the Slavic field was, therefore, taken over by the Army Language Training Programs.

We have greatly benefited from the development of these programs. . . . But they exposed our profession to another type of danger

—the belief in a miraculous "Army Method" of foreign language teaching which produced quick results while the "backward" teachers in our colleges and universities were forcing students to slave long hours over their books without too much success. The "Speak-Easy-Schools of Languages," as Professor Doyle aptly terms them, sprang up overnight; Russian textbooks, bearing such fetching titles as "Russian Without Toil" and "Russian in a Hurry," appeared on the market. But if the *uninformed* public *didn't* know it, the members of the teaching profession knew very well that it was not the miraculous army method but, in the words of Professor Doyle again, "hard work, long hours, strong motivation, and tiny classes which were producing results that any competent foreign language teacher could have produced under the same favorable conditions at any time in the previous half century, or more."

The turning point in the development of Slavic studies followed 1945, when it became clear that the Soviet Union had come to occupy the center of the political stage. President Coleman's survey, conducted in 1946, indicated that there were at that time 190 academic institutions teaching Slavic languages—quite a change from the figure of 1935.

After World War II the universities began to invest even more heavily in Russian language and area programs. These programs were established with the generous financial aid of private foundations, with full and effective co-operation on the part of the university faculties and administrations. An extensive program of fellowships offered by these new Slavic centers attracted many post-war graduate students. In addition, much was accomplished in these post-war years in developing research and publication projects in the Slavic fields.

To the language teacher these programs were a welcome "shot in the arm," but again they exposed them to a new danger—facing the pressure of the demands for teaching courses in Slavic Culture and Civilization rather than the language skills. Many voices were heard in warning of the danger of overworking language teachers and eventually even losing them as language teachers. We have ample proof now that these warnings were justified and that during

these years we have lost some of our best language teachers who are now teaching courses in Slavic Comparative or World Literature. While in some cases the motivation for this change might have been a happy personal choice, there is no doubt that the greater prestige enjoyed by the teachers of Literature in our colleges and universities played some part in their decision. I might add that even now many foreign language teachers still suffer from this "inferiority complex." One very often hears, as if by way of apology, "I really am a Literature man, but"

Yet, by 1957, we had a sizable new generation of American Slavicists, "home-grown" and "home-trained," capable and sufficient in number to cope with the needs of both our academic and government institutions—or, at least, so it seemed to some people. . . . After the launching of the Soviet Sputnik a wave of hysteria swept the editorial pages of our national press, taking our educators to task for neglecting to develop an adequate supply of Russian language specialists. If experiences of the last war have demonstrated how dangerously unprepared we were for a sudden military crisis and how narrow was the circle of properly trained Slavicists available for the war effort, events of the past year produced the same cries of panic in educational circles. The breakthrough of the Slavic languages to the secondary school level was in part the result and it may very well be regarded as the second turning point in the development of Slavic studies in this country.

We are told that Slavic specialists are needed in great numbers for Government services and for scholarly scientific and academic research projects—and what's most important, of course, for the teaching of Slavic languages, not only in the undergraduate and graduate programs of colleges and universities but on the secondary level as well. Moreover, there is no reason to exclude Russian from the MLA-FLES program, introducing it into the elementary schools. Only by developing the Slavic languages as an integral part of our educational system on all educational levels can we produce the needed number of trained specialists in this field. Without this broad base, the inevitable process of elimination in the training process will leave us with the same *limited* number of Slavic

specialists which will, of course, work against our vital national interests.

The AATSEEL had the foresight to organize a special committee to promote the study of Slavic and East European languages in secondary schools. As chairman of this committee, I found myself a center of feverish activity; and all our members had to be pressed into service, conducting surveys, coordinating information, serving as a consultative body in meeting such problems as teacher shortages, lack of teaching materials, and the resistance of some communities and some school administrators and school boards to changes in the established secondary school curriculum. I am happy to report that Russian language programs initiated this year in about 140 public and 39 private and parochial schools are off to a good start, in an atmosphere of genuine interest and support from the administration and the community.

Still much remains to be done. I would like first to advocate the "liberation" of Slavic studies from the political character which tends to limit them in scope. I would like to see an expansion of the scope of Slavic studies, which would enable us to change the emphasis from the present concern with the Russian language *only* to the concern with *all* Slavic and East European languages. If I may, I would like to quote the distinguished Polish-American scholar, Professor Haleski: "Scholars must realize at long last that the non-Russian part of Slavic and East Europe is a field of study clearly distinct and different from the field of Russian studies and that it deserves the same attention as a subject equally important in itself and not merely as an appendix which is justified for inclusion on the ground that the material will assist the development of a more complex understanding of Russia."

Our complex, modern society requires a broadening of our educational program on all levels and the changing political scene will demand knowledge of heretofore unknown subjects which were never considered directly useful and immediately practical. I shall never forget the day when I opened the financial page of the *Washington Post* and found there an article urging parents to invest for their children's future, not by buying stocks and bonds but by teaching them Russian!

Foreign language instruction affects all levels of education, and a sound program of improvement must be worked out in a coordinated way. Secondary schools, teachers colleges, schools of education, technical schools, and liberal arts colleges must work together to close the gap separating the secondary school and college education.

Though illustrious linguists and theoreticians may set up new trails in foreign language learning and bask in the limelight of well-deserved public acclaim, I do not think that we should lose sight of the fact that the hard-working, dedicated, modest, and harassed language teacher should be given the full credit and the dignity that his work and his role in the educational system justly deserve. There are still many educators—administrators and faculty members alike—who do not understand the significance of language learning in the educational process, and in some cases still believe that everything important is written or spoken in English!

We may very well profit from our past adversities. We start in a new and stimulating atmosphere of the national concern with the quality and quantity of modern foreign language instruction. The burden of the past sits lightly on our shoulders. We stand to benefit greatly by the present extensive research in the techniques and materials of modern foreign language teaching conducted by our professional organizations and individual schools. Our professional organizations have grown and we enjoy their active support.

American Slavicists have come a long way. The days of lonely isolation in the field of modern foreign languages are over; the days of the precarious existence at the mercy of highly unstable enrollments are over too. Teachers of Slavic languages are no longer regarded as "peculiar fellows" teaching "exotic" subjects. The American Slavicists have been given national recognition; they have been accepted as equals by their colleagues on the campus; and together with other teachers of modern foreign languages they are ready to face the challenge of a vigorous and rewarding future.

HELEN YAKOBSON

The George Washington University

The Limitations of Psycholinguistics

A CRITICAL point has been reached in the development of comparative linguistics where a new look at the field of psycholinguistics is greatly needed. Ideas involving psychology, culture and linguistics are freely discussed with little realization of the great changes in these fields which have taken place within the past fifty years, and especially within the past twenty. As it is, the field of psycholinguistics bids fair to becoming an epistemological dog in the manger if its bounds are not set and its limitations not discerned.

In a recent article on "Spanish and the Spanish Psyche" (*Modern Language Journal*, April, 1958, p. 175) Mr. Dalai Brenes attacks the thesis that "differences in the morphology and syntax of languages correspond to psychological differences in the speakers of those two languages." He adequately reports the absence of "scientific evidence" and concludes that language and culture necessarily involve the field of psycholinguistics. In the light of psychology in 1958 this need not be so.

"Psychology has developed a field of research that may no doubt be useful or valuable in itself but it throws little or no light on problems of the normal human mind or soul. . . . There are certain courses that psychology has elected to follow that have estranged it, perhaps permanently, from the truly mental field" (Benjamin Lee Whorf in *Language, Thought and Reality*, Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1956, p. 40). Just as modern psychology has tended away from the general social studies toward a more precise if questionable scientific basis, so psycholinguistics has inevitably been drawn in the same direction. Its field of operation has necessarily been limited, and so too, apparently, the field of vision of those who operate within it. Probably the best known of participants in this study is Mr. Joshua Whatmough, whose rejection of the idea of a fundamental relationship between language and culture is well known. "There is no indication whatever as yet that grammatical

features, e.g. inflexional structure or a preference for the active construction, have psychological any more than cultural implications" (*Language: A Modern Synthesis*, St. Martin's Press, N. Y., 1956, p. 193).

While work in psycholinguistics is of interest and importance, we must not be blinded by its apparent claim to be the true path to knowledge, and its eagerness to attack any other method, whether it be called intuitive, inductive, revelatory, inspired, horse sense, philosophical or metaphysical.

With regard to language and psychological differences, Mr. Brenes for his part states that, "At present there is not enough scientific evidence, either linguistic or psychological, which warrants such an assumption" (*loc. cit.*). While we are waiting for psycholinguistics to decide the question one way or another, Spanish teachers do not have the right to disregard in their classrooms the solid opinions of writers such as Salvador de Madariaga, although his humanity may upset the more confirmed psycholinguists. He states in his *Ingleses, Franceses, Españoles* (Hermes, Mexico, 1951), "las lenguas vivas son la expresión más directa del carácter nacional. Constituyen la primera expresión del espíritu del hombre sobre el mundo que le rodea. Los vocablos que imagina a fin de describir cosas y emociones corresponden a las ideas que de ellas se forma; el sistema que poco a poco constituye a fin de utilizar sus vocablos de un modo comprensible es una imagen directa del modo como piensa. Una gramática es una filosofía" (p. 221-222).

Why, Mr. Madariaga: How can you say that? You have no scientific basis for making such statements.

Mr. Madariaga can do no less than acknowledge the "linguistic" weakness of his position in using languages to compare psychological differences. He says, "Al comparar las lenguas para los fines de un paralelo como el que nos ocupa, es imposible limitarse a un criterio estrictamente filológico. Casi pudiera decirse que la

filología, al menos si se comprende de un modo estrecho, puede actuar más bien como obstáculo que como estímulo para tal comparación" (*op. cit.*, p. 221).

If the printer were feeling cooperative, you would read the following in bold face caps: Our modern graduate student is caught between the apathy of the traditional historical linguist and the hidebound zeal of the modern psycholinguist, so that most of our great universities are anxious that this student have a good acquaintance with the Menéndez Pidal school of historical grammar on the one hand and/or the latest work in anthropology, psychology and psycholinguistics on the other, while few are concerned about his acquisition of a humane view of the Spanish language through the eyes of Madariaga, Eduardo Benot, Criado de Val, Vossler, or even Gili y Gaya, who in the absence of an adequate bibliography, dares nevertheless to explain, "Como la descripción de los hechos sintácticos carecería a menudo de sentido sin buscarles su fundamento psicológico e histórico hasta donde lo podamos alcanzar, nos serviremos de explicaciones de este carácter en la medida en que sean indispensable para comprender los fenómenos sintácticos que estudiámos" (*Curso Superior de Sintaxis Española*, Spes, Barcelona, 1954, p. 12).

The psycholinguist is understandably afraid of studies which purport to reveal definite, large-scale correlations between language and culture, but in his hasty retreat he passes by even those "traceable affinities" sought by Whorf. Yet it is these affinities which when observed in their proper perspective reveal many of our own ways of thinking as well as those of the other language with which they are compared.

In the article mentioned Mr. Brenes objects in general to the premise that there is a relationship between language and the psychology of the people who speak it. Specifically he objects to six examples mentioned in my article, "College Spanish on the College Level" (*Modern Language Journal*, May, 1957): 1—That the student should be prepared to appreciate situations in which Spanish is more likely to use a preterite tense for an imminent future than is English; 2—That distinction between the imperfect and preterite in Spanish involve a

greater concept of perfection and imperfection than does English; 3—That Spanish cannot easily express the English idea of *becoming*; 4—That the use of past participles and paraphrases where English uses present participles reveals a different attitude toward certain actions; 5—That *me* has a number of meanings for the Spanish speaking person; and 6—That Spanish thought tends to develop from the general to the specific.

Whether or not the use of a preterite to indicate an imminent future comes as a surprise to the normal speaker of English may indeed be waiting for scientific proof. The point is that the English-speaking student must rethink his linguistic resources when faced with this idea that a preterite tense may lose its meaning in time and preserve only its meaning of perfection, so that it may refer to future time. We should of course call the students' attention to a similar possibility in English, and for each individual there will be a different value in doing so, but for each there will be a better understanding of both languages.

With reference to the second item our attention is called to the fact that between *llovió* and *llovia*, the latter may be translated neatly by *it was raining*. This is at best a paraphrase in English, and we cannot deny that a great many of the ideas involved in such studies can be paraphrased. What is important, however, is that *it was raining* does not convey a distinction between *estaba lloviendo* or *estuvo lloviendo*. The fact that the English-speaking student rarely uses the latter construction is a clue to the baffled feeling he has in the presence of this idea of perfection compared with imperfection, and he deserves more than a structural explanation, even if this must be speculative.

With regard to *becoming* in Spanish Mr. Brenes finds a simple parallel for each usage of *to become*. We agree that any translation is at best inadequate, and that no word pair will cover precisely the same area, but the problem is not as simple as this. The English idea of "process" is rarely conveyed in the so-called equivalent in Spanish. T. B. Irving has studied the question thoroughly and observes, "Precisely because of this stress on aspect, and because the Spaniard senses the difference between dynamic existence or essence as con-

trasted with static condition or location, which is exemplified in the verbs *ser* and *estar*, there is not so great a need for a verb meaning to become in his language" (*Modern Language Journal*, "Completion and Becoming in the Spanish Verb," December, 1953, p. 412). Such observations and the detailed study behind them clearly indicate a fundamental difference in looking at a basic concept of life and imply a need for considering it in the classroom. This concept is of course not clearly indicated for Mr. Brenes and those who think like him. We are obviously speaking a different language based on a premise which does not enter the realm of psycholinguistics and which should not be limited by it. "La lengua y la poesía pertenecen al reino de la fantasía y . . . tienen sólo una realidad mediata . . ." (Karl Vossler in *Algunos Carácteres de la Cultura Española*, Espasa-Calpe, Madrid, 1941, p. 53).

Regarding the use of past participles and subordinate clauses where we in English would use present participles, the introduction of the static participial forms ending in *-nte* revives an old question which has been discussed extensively. The conclusion has generally been that this form is no more than an adjective today, that it continues to be used in certain fixed phrases and situations, and that its verbal qualities are minimal. Such an interpolation in the discussion however cannot disguise the fact that we in English see certain conditions as in a process and the Spanish may view the same process as a perfective condition, and that the attention of our students should be called to these different ways of viewing the same situation.

In criticizing the idea that *me* in Spanish has a number of meanings, Mr. Brenes implies that the context of the sentence will lead to a correct interpretation of the idea which the speaker wishes to convey. This is precisely the error into which we should not allow our students to fall. Spanish demands of its listener a greater intuitive understanding than does English, and the student of the language must understand this, whether he is dealing with *me* as in *Me lo compró*, where it may mean *for me* or *from me*, or *su*, with its meanings determined either by context or by the intuitive understanding between speaker and listener. The point again is not

whether *me* has a number of meanings, but that our student be made aware of the fact that the listener in Spanish is drawn to the speaker much more closely than perhaps is the case in other languages. "En otras palabras: en el arte, en la poesía y en su lengua, la distancia y margen entre hablar y oír, entre la creación y la percepción, es mucho menor que en las de otros pueblos" (Vossler, *op. cit.*, p. 57).

Without considering my statement that not every verb will fit this "neat pattern," Mr. Brenes objects to the idea that Spanish tends to work from the general to the specific, either in verb forms or in substantive phrases. The meanings of the particular phrase, *el arte gallego barroco*, and its English translations hinge on what is normal procedure in the two languages, not what is a possibility. The fact is that preposition is normal for English adjectives, regardless of the emphasis we wish to give them, while pre-position for such adjectives in Spanish is *afectiva* and calls greater attention to the quality. For the same purposes of emphasis in English we must normally paraphrase, as for instance, *baroque art which is Galician*, etc., while similar ideas may be expressed in Spanish through word order rather than paraphrase, and, at least from the point of view of a number of Spanish-speaking people, from the general to the specific. Related to this concept is Gili y Gaya's idea that, "Los adjetivos contribuyen a dar al estilo carácter sintético, mientras que los pospuestos revelan más bien una posición analítica" (*op. cit.*, p. 195). This is of course not the only consideration in the relationship of adjective to noun, but it is of primary importance. What is more important is that the student realize the different ways of seeing similar objects, not whether two persons quibble over whether the subject, inflection or action of a verb is more general and another less general. From a technical point of view perhaps, whether regarding adjectives and nouns, or verbs and their attributives, it is more than likely that by attempting to establish degrees of generality among unlike quantities, we have indeed left the scientific field and can rely only on the way in which we feel about these ideas. The important thing is to convey to the student the reason for this feeling so that he may better understand Spanish as compared with his own English.

It is this situation which the psycholinguist cannot cope with, any more than he can cope with the idea of a definite relationship between language structure and culture. He forgets that language is a part of culture, and, especially with regard to Spanish, more than petrified psychology. "True understanding of the nature and function of language furnishes the best and surest avenue to an understanding of the culture and the way of life of the people who speak it" (Henry Lee Smith, Jr., in *Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English*, Harvard University Press, 1956, p. 2).

If psycholinguistics belongs to the field of psychology it will have its own gifts for the language teacher, but it must not, because of its plausible scientific basis, be accepted as the source of all understanding of the relationship between language and culture. The latter, subject to free speculation, must be given a different name, perhaps one of the following: cultural linguistics, philosophical linguistics or metalinguistics.

ERNEST STOWELL

Wisconsin State College

* * *

Lecturing Latin American Universities

The Conference Board Committee on International Exchange of Persons, which nominates candidates for university teaching appointments abroad under the Government's Educational Exchange Program, and assists in arranging for the placement of scholars from other countries in universities in the United States, has been asked to ascertain the interest of U. S. scholars in filling short-term lecturing appointments in Latin American universities in 1959, and also the interest of universities in this country in inviting scholars from South and Central America to participate in either their regular programs of instruction or in special seminars they may be planning. The Committee's role is to assist in matching, insofar as possible, the interests of Latin American universities with those of U. S. scholars; and the interests of U. S. universities with those of Latin American scholars.

To this end, the Committee would welcome: (1) inquiries from U. S. scholars, fluent in Spanish, who are interested in short-term lecturing appointments during the spring, summer or fall of 1959; (2) inquiries from U. S. scholars desiring to lecture in Latin America during the academic year beginning in most South American countries in March 1959 and terminating about December 1. There are opportunities for lecturing in such subjects as American literature and civilization, archeology, chemistry, economics, education (preschool, secondary and higher), English composition, international law, medical sciences, physics, social work, sociology, and the teaching of English as a foreign language. Additional requests may be received during the coming months in virtually any field.

The Committee is striving to develop a substantial roster of persons wishing to be considered for appointments under both the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts. A description of the Register and a data form will be sent upon request. Those interested in 1959 appointments should write immediately to the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington 25, D.C.

* * *

On Language and Culture

MY INTEREST in publishing "Spanish and the Spanish Psyche" in *The Modern Language Journal* of April, 1958, as a commentary on Professor Stowell's article on "College Spanish on the College Level" which appeared in the same journal in May, 1957, was to second his plea that language in college should be taught at college level. My intent now in taking advantage again of the hospitality of this journal to comment anew on the same subject is the same. The following remarks are not aimed at winning a debate with Professor Stowell; they are meant to evoke further thinking in others along lines which are of so much interest to the two of us. Professor Stowell has made clear his approach to the problem of the relation between language and culture and possible applications to the presentation of Spanish at the college level. I will do the same. The reader can examine these two approaches to the problem and choose whichever suits him best. What is more desirable, however, is that he should elaborate his own.

It is not my desire or intention to preempt the study of the possible relations between human psychology, language, and culture in favor of any given discipline, not even in favor of psycholinguistics. On the contrary, I think that the language teacher should examine the problem from whatever viewpoint he wants; however, he must bear in mind that in presenting his conclusions to the student, he has to do so in such a way that the student does not think he has received a final answer.

I said in my previous article that "The premise implicit in 'College Spanish on the College Level' [Professor Stowell's May article] is that differences in the morphology and syntax of languages correspond to psychological differences in the speakers of those two languages. At present there is not enough scientific evidence, either linguistic or psychological, which warrants such an assumption." Granted that there are peoples who are different culturally and linguistically, there is no evidence or logical neces-

sity which proves that the differences in morphology and syntax correspond to the cultural differences observable. To prove that there is such a correspondence would require proof of a kind of cause and effect relationship between culture and language. If such a relationship does not exist, then language differences, in this respect, are merely random and mean nothing as an index to cultural or psychological differences.

Peoples who speak the same language do not always have the same psychology. No one would contend that the differences between British and American English are substantial enough to make them two different languages. Nor does anyone assert that the vital psychological differences between British and Americans can be catalogued, detected, by the study of the differences in vocabulary and syntax which exist in the dialects of these two peoples. Where, for instance, in British English are there syntactic elements not found in American English which correspond to the profound differences in national attitudes towards the rights of the citizen, or the general attitudes, of the British citizen towards law and order, towards the family, towards parental discipline? Or, if not in the syntax, in what other linguistic category can one obtain correspondences necessarily related to these and other substantive cultural and psychological differences between British and American?

Again, the Spanish people are taken to be friendly and warmhearted while, by contrast, the British and Americans are cold and aloof. And yet notice how the English speaker begins a letter to a total stranger with "My dear Mrs. Smith," and then closes it with "I am very truly yours." I hazard the guess that it would not be the wisest thing to write in Spanish to a stranger in some such terms as *Mi querida señora de Herrero* and then sign the letter with the warmhearted *Soy verdaderamente suyo*, not to say *tuyo*. And if there be the desire to carry the comparison a bit further, see what we do in

the United States with the verb *to love*. We love God, country, parents, sweethearts, winter or summer, pickled herring. The warmhearted Spaniard uses a simple "it pleases me." When the Spaniard loves, he often differentiates between *querer* and *amar*.

The preceding observations show that we must have means for deciding which linguistic phenomena and which psychological or cultural manifestations we are going to choose for making our study. How do we determine that an item is significant for our study? How do we determine when a linguistic difference means a difference in psychology?

Of course psychological and cultural differences exist. The question here is whether we can determine those differences through linguistic analysis alone. Perhaps we sometimes determine the differences first by non-linguistic means and then force them to correspond to linguistic facts.

In his article in this issue, Professor Stowell states that "Mr. Brenes objects in general to the premise that there is a relationship between language and the psychology of the people who speak it. Specifically he objects to six examples mentioned in my article 'College Spanish on the College Level' (*Modern Language Journal*, May, 1957)." It would be more accurate to state that I called attention to the fact that there is no scientific evidence which justifies such a premise and that I questioned whether Professor Stowell's examples necessarily prove what they were intended to prove. Actually, I am trying to find out whether in the analysis of varying cultures assumptions about the supposed correlation between linguistic and psychological differences are tenable.

As for the six points which Professor Stowell lists in his present article, I will only call attention to the third, the one in which it is asserted that "Spanish cannot easily express the English idea of *becoming*." What is the criterion for determining what is easily expressed and what isn't? For example, the English speaker says "a shoe sewing machine" and the Spanish says "una máquina de coser (para) zapatos." Does the English speaker have an easier time of it than the Spanish or vice versa? Do the examples prove that, because English uses four words to the Spanish five, or possibly six, Eng-

lish has a 25 or 50 percent advantage in case of expression? The same problem arises when determining the comparative ease of English and Spanish ways of expressing *becoming*.

Take another example given by Professor Stowell: Spanish *me*. In his May, 1957, article he says: "Here is *me*, which might mean to imply from our English point of view, *me, to me, for me, from me, my, away, on me, myself*, and so on and on." And in this issue he points out that "Spanish demands of its listener a greater intuitive understanding than does English, and the student of the language must understand this, whether he is dealing with *me* as in *Me lo compró*, where it may mean *for me* or *from me*, or *su*, with its meanings determined either by context or by the intuitive understanding between speaker and listener. The point again is not whether *me* has a number of meanings, but that our student be made aware that the listener in Spanish is drawn to the speaker much more closely than perhaps is the case in other languages."

On the basis of a type of linguistic analysis which bears in mind that language is used in context, one cannot claim that the use of *me* in Spanish proves "that the listener in Spanish is drawn to the speaker much more closely than perhaps is the case in other languages." If one wants to know what *me* means to a native speaker of Spanish who knows no other language, all one has to do is ask him. If he understand the question at all, he will say that *me* means *a mí*. I have made the experiment several times and that was the answer. And, in a way, that answer is to be expected. Whenever he uses *me*, he can use the redundant *a mí*. In *me veo* or other reflexives, he will say *a mí mismo*. He sees no difference in the *me* of *me lo quitó* when compared with the *me* of *me lo dió*. He claims the *me* means the same in both cases; only the verb is different. In the case of constructions like *me lo imagino* or *me lo temo*, speakers said it meant *yo* or *yo mismo*. I do not claim universal validity for these reactions but before any other dicta are accepted as valid, the evidence on which they are based should be known. Are we justified in telling the student about the greater intuition demanded by the Spanish listener or that the latter "is drawn to the speaker much more closely than perhaps is the case in other

languages" on the basis of the above examples?

In dealing with the significance of adjective position in the two languages, Professor Stowell rightly points out in his present article that "The fact is that pre-position is normal for English adjectives, regardless of the emphasis we wish to give them, while pre-position for such adjectives in Spanish is *afectiva* and calls greater attention to the quality. For the same purpose of emphasis in English we must normally paraphrase, as for instance *baroque art which is Galician*, etc., while similar ideas may be expressed in Spanish through word order rather than paraphrase. . . ." This is partially right. An examination of the adjective in spoken English and not in its written representation, which is not language but a picture of language, shows that English is rigid in adjective placement relative to the noun because adjective emphasis in English is signalled by intonation and not by positional changes. In the phrase "*Galician baroque art*" or "*baroque Galician art*," we can emphasize any of the components by means of intonation. Should we want to give emphasis to "Galician," we do not have to say "*baroque art which is Galician*," as Professor Stowell claims; we can say "*Galician baroque art*." English emphasizes by intonation, Spanish by word order. What does this prove about the psychologies of the two peoples?

It is also claimed by Professor Stowell that in a sequence such as *el arte barroco gallego*, the progression is from the general to the specific. Here the Spanish speaker shows his "tendency to think and see everything from the general to the specific, as compared to our English insistence on seeing everything from the specific to the general." But by what system of logical categories can we determine which of the concepts, art, baroque, or Galician, is the broader and which is the narrower? Is the concept of *duality* twice as general as the concept of *unity*,

and that of *many* broader than either of these?

And finally a commentary on Sr. de Madariaga's Platonic notion that "Las lenguas vivas son la expresión más directa del espíritu del hombre sobre el mundo que le rodea. Los vocablos que imagina a fin de describir las cosas y emociones corresponden a las ideas que de ellas se forma. . . ." Disregarding all facts about the evolutionary origins of man, one can easily imagine pristine man, newly created, inventing language, a kind of Rodin's thinker verbalizing his thoughts and emotions. Sr. de Madariaga's theory is valid only if that is the way language began. This is the implication of his statement. However, assuming that he is not talking about language in general, but about English, Spanish, and French, how can his theory be validated? If it is assumed that French and Spanish began as such in the eighth century and English in the eleventh, how can it be said in any meaningful way that those languages were the invention of any one person or group? What are the "vocablos" which were invented? What happened to Vulgar Latin? What happened to Anglo-Saxon? Sr. de Madariaga is quite right when he implies that fanciful theories become untenable when faced by facts. I am not saying that students should not be encouraged to read Sr. de Madariaga's works. By all means, encourage them to do so; but teach them also to distinguish between felicity of expression and truth.

By now the reader is aware that the approaches used by Professor Stowell and myself are different. He can decide which one is of greater value for his own methodology and for his own examination of the possible relations between language and psychology. Of course, it could well be that neither one is satisfactory for him.

DALAI BRENES

Cornell University

* * *

The MLA has accepted, as fiscal and administrative agent, a grant of \$200,000 from The Ford Foundation for the establishment in Washington, D. C. of a Center, for Applied Linguistics. It has begun operation with Dr. Charles A. Ferguson (Harvard) as its first director. It will serve as a clearing house of information for universities, government agencies, and other institutions or individuals concerned with the application of linguistic science to practical language-problems.

* * *

The Function of the Written Exercise in the Language Class Hour

THERE is no activity in the elementary and intermediate language class hour which has been more consecrated by tradition than the correction of written exercises. To most language teachers, this is an indispensable part of the class hour, one which often consumes from one-third to one-half of classroom time and on occasion even more. In view of the great amount of time devoted to this activity, would it not be well to examine the traditional ways of handling exercises in class and to try to evaluate their contribution to language learning? In brief, is the time spent on exercises in the classroom worthwhile? Or could part or all of this time be more profitably spent on other activities: conversation, pronunciation, grammar drill, for instance? Does going over exercises in class really help to teach students language?

A written exercise is usually a set of sentences which oblige the student to manipulate the foreign language in some way. Ordinarily, exercises are worked by the students before class, normally in writing. These exercises may be all-French¹ or they may be English-to-French translation. The present discussion applies in the main to all-French exercises. But what will be said about them seems applicable to some extent to English-to-French translation exercises as well.

The traditional procedure for handling exercises in class is the following: the pupils have before them the exercises they have prepared in writing outside of class; the teacher calls on a student to read a sentence in French, supplying the required form or making the necessary change; as he reads, the other members of the class correct any errors which appear in their own sentences. Or, each pupil is assigned a sentence or two to write on the board, and afterward the sentences are corrected, each pupil reading what he has written on the board. When so handled, the exercise takes up a considerable part of the class hour—anywhere from fifteen to thirty minutes. It is probable that all

of us have attended language classes where so much time was spent on the correction of exercises that little was left for any other activity.

And what do the students do during the long correction period while their classmates are reading the exercise sentences one by one? Some of them doubtless follow the reading attentively. Others are bored and daydream. Still others, knowing that they can "get away with it" because of the slow pace, write part or all of their assignment as the correction proceeds. The benefits of the exercise for such students are not obvious.

Teachers who spend a large part of the class hour correcting exercises defend their practice in various ways:

1. They say that the reading of exercises by pupils is "pupil activity," therefore good educational practice. But if this relatively passive type of pupil "activity" is compared in value with activities in which pupils really participate (e.g., conversation, pronunciation drill, the writing of dictation by the entire class), it seems relatively ineffective.

2. They say that the reading of exercises affords pronunciation practice to the pupils. While it is true that in reading the sentences in French the pupils pronounce the words, the assumption that this is beneficial to pronunciation is a dubious one. When reading an exercise, the pupil is not concentrating on pronunciation but rather on supplying the correct words. Let the teacher who now regularly spends twenty minutes having pupils read exercises cover these exercises in five minutes and regularly spend the remaining fifteen in vigorous pronunciation drill, and he should see a marked improvement in the pronunciation of his students.

3. They say that the correction of exercises teaches the pupil grammar. Indeed it does,

¹ Throughout this article the term *French* is used for the sake of convenience to indicate any modern language. Wherever *French* appears, German, Russian, Spanish or any other modern language is also implied.

eventually; but there are far more efficient ways of doing so. Suppose the topic for the day is the direct object pronoun. Instead of spending twenty relatively inactive minutes correcting exercises, let the instructor send the entire class to the board and spend about fifteen minutes dictating sentences with noun objects which the pupils then change to pronoun objects. Let him follow this board drill with five minutes of correcting home exercises, and his pupils will leave the classroom with a much improved understanding of changing noun objects to pronoun objects. When teaching certain types of constructions (e.g., those in which the French forms differ entirely from their English counterparts, such as the French equivalents of: *He wants me to know my lesson*, or, *We have been here for ten minutes*, or *Where was he the day when you arrived*), it is effective to send the students to the board and drill them on such patterns by dictating numerous examples in English and having everyone write the French equivalents.

4. They say that the correction of sentences gives the pupil the opportunity of asking questions on problems arising in the exercise. So it does, and to a limited extent this is a useful feature of the correction period. But this procedure soon reaches a point of diminishing returns; while the teacher is answering individual questions, the attention of most of the other pupils wanders. It is preferable to make the grammar of the day quite clear by earlier blackboard drill.

Despite the eloquent defense of the practice, there seems to be no evidence that the results obtained from the correction of exercises are so remarkable as to justify the use of one-third or even one-half of the class hour or that it should be given preference over conversation or pronunciation drill, as it often is.

How should exercises be handled then? How can they be taken up rapidly, yet effectively? Certainly they are important enough in the total process of language teaching to merit checking over in some way.

There are a few who take the extreme view that the teacher should simply collect the exercises, correct them himself outside of the class hour, and return them to the students on the following day. This procedure, while not with-

out merit when used occasionally, not only requires a great deal of the teacher's time, but also fails to give the pupil an early check on what he has done at home and affords no opportunity at all for student questions in class. There should be a compromise between this extreme, where the exercises are not taken up at all in class, and the other, where a disproportionate amount of time is spent in having the *students* read their exercise sentences one by one.

The following procedure provides for the rapid correction of exercises without entailing the time-consuming feature of the traditional method. The students take out their exercises, and then *the teacher himself*, not the students, reads the correct forms as rapidly as practicable, while the students check their forms, correcting those which are wrong. If the forms are difficult, the teacher may spell them out or even write them on the board rapidly while saying them. On days when exercises would be difficult to check without a correctly written version before the class, the teacher may even send one or two students to the board to write out the forms of certain exercises while the rest of the class is engaged in conversation or pronunciation drill. These written forms may then be used during the correction period to supplement the forms read orally by the teacher. The important feature of this procedure is the rapid reading by the teacher instead of the slow reading by the student. In a college class, at least, the activity of correcting exercises can thus be confined to about five minutes per class hour. Naturally, the teacher must read fairly rapidly, and the students must be trained to follow the reading and motivated to make corrections where necessary. The instructor must insist from the beginning of the course that a correct or corrected copy be turned in immediately after the class correction of exercises.

There are several interesting variants of the procedure, but each variant limits the correction period to about five minutes. In order to make the correction of exercises more than the reading of isolated words, the instructor may read the sentence rapidly up to the word which must be supplied, then the students read in unison the required word. By way of example, let us assume such a sentence as: *Les élèves*

trouvent (their) livres sur la table. The instructor reads: *Les élèves trouvent . . .* and the students then say *leurs*. The instructor adds: ". . . with an -s" or "l-e-u-r-s". In this variant, the limited pupil participation does not slow down the correction, since it is the teacher who controls the speed by his reading of the sentence and by the rapidity with which he moves from sentence to sentence.

Part of the usefulness of the written exercise comes during this rapid class correction. But the greatest value of exercises in language learning derives not so much from their correction during the class hour as from their proper use *before* and *after* the class hour. The two principal values of exercises are: 1. the training they offer in precise thinking through the practice afforded the pupil by a careful working out of a grammatical problem before the recitation; 2. the pattern drill which results from having the pupil go over the corrected exercises orally by himself after class. Unfortunately, it is not easy to persuade the students to work out their exercises with scrupulous care, and it is still more difficult to convince them that after class they should read over these exercises again and again until they can supply the required words without the slightest hesitation. The instructor must realize this and find means to cope with it.

In recent years a number of entirely new drill type pattern exercises devised by linguistic specialists have begun to appear in language textbooks. Many of these new exercises are designed to be prepared orally rather than in writing and to be done orally in class. Such exercises do not properly come under the scope of this article, but it might not be out of place here to say a few words concerning their use. Such exercises may be done profitably during the class hour if the instructor can keep the interest and attention of the entire class and if not too much time per hour is devoted to them. Yet, before using a given exercise, the

teacher must always ask himself: "Will doing such an exercise in class be as valuable to the pupils as some oral exercise of my own devising?" As a matter of fact, it is very difficult to find exercises read from a book which have as stimulating and as instructive a value to the student as a rapidly improvised drill directed by a good teacher. What book exercises on the use of pronoun objects give the students the same spontaneous conversation practice as a series of skillfully worded questions from the teacher which the student must answer by using a pronoun object? Which is more effective: a book exercise in which the student, Mr. Jones, reads aloud *Je vois le livre*, then, making the required change, says *Je le vois*, or the spontaneous drill during which the pupil, book closed, hears the teacher say: *Monsieur Jones, voyez-vous le livre?* and Mr. Jones answers, *Oui, monsieur, je le vois*? We recognize, of course, the great value pattern exercises can have when studied orally outside of class and even during the class hour. But we suggest that it is important for the instructor to consider the comparative values of the different types of oral drill.

In brief, we believe that written exercises should be corrected during the class hour but in the fastest way possible, namely, by having the teacher read the correct forms while the students check their work. By using this method of checking exercises, comparatively little time need be spent on them. The rest of the class hour can then be devoted to more stimulating language activities, such as conversation and pronunciation. But to derive the greatest value from the written exercise, the students must work these exercises logically and carefully before class and must then read them orally after class until the correct forms can be supplied rapidly and the desired language patterns are well impressed on the learner's mind.

WALTER MEIDEN

Ohio State University

* * *

The Mountain Interstate Foreign Language Conference last fall gathered representatives from 14 colleges and some high schools to a two-day session at Carson-Newman College. The 1959 meeting will be held at the University of West Virginia. The Executive Committee in charge includes Dr. Armand E. Singer (West Virginia), Professor Carey S. Crawford (Carson-Newman), and Miss Blanche Banta (Pikesville College).

* * *

Intensive Method Techniques for Intermediate Courses

TO THOSE of us who were teaching modern languages before World War II, the intensive method techniques developed in connection with the Army Specialized Training Program were most welcome. The aural-oral emphasis brought with it increased enthusiasm on the part of students and a greater satisfaction to the instructor. The wide-spread popularity of the intensive method techniques has been sustained through the intervening years, a fact that can be deduced from the increasing number of first-year texts in which the aural-oral skills are stressed.

Teachers will agree that the enthusiasm and excitement aroused in the elementary classes are often lacking in the intermediate courses. The authors of this article, however, are convinced that the enthusiasm gained in the first-year courses can be maintained through the second year by the use of intensive method techniques adapted to the second-year reading material. Those techniques which give abundant practice in hearing and speaking the language should be preferred to those which develop facts about the language. Out of this conviction has come the decision not to use a review grammar at the intermediate level. We also suggest that instructors avoid those techniques which require long recitations by one student. Class time is not efficiently spent if the teacher says "read and translate" and then waits interminably until the student has recited. The ideal is to have each student say sub-vocally what one student is saying aloud. As in first-year classes, the grammar should be taught functionally.

How can we develop the aural-oral ability along with the reading ability of second-year students? Practice teachers and students in the methods classes invariably suggest that the assigned reading material be discussed in the foreign language. There is a rude awakening when this is tried out in the classroom. Many

students cannot even understand the question asked in a foreign language; those who do, answer in a halting fashion. The instructor must develop separately the two skills involved—aural comprehension and oral facility.

Essential to the development of these skills is the "basic sentence." After the instructor is satisfied that the students have understood the reading assignment, the attention of the class is directed for the rest of the period to certain sentences selected from the passage by the instructor. By intensive work with these sentences, the instructor develops aural comprehension, pronunciation, sentence intonation, knowledge of the grammar, and oral fluency.

Here, step by step, are the procedures suggested:

ASSIGNMENT. Students are asked to prepare a passage for translation from the foreign language into English, the length of the assignment depending on the language studied and the difficulty of the selection. The students are also asked to know the material of the selection well enough to be able with books closed to translate sentences to be chosen by the instructor. At the time of the assignment, students are not told which sentences will be selected.

PREPARATION BY THE INSTRUCTOR. Before the next meeting of the class, the instructor examines the assigned passage and selects certain basic sentences. The latter may be chosen from the standpoint of grammar review, idiom, or key importance in the discussion of the story. The instructor will often find it necessary to edit the text to suit his purpose.

RECITATION ON THE ASSIGNMENT. At the beginning of the recitation, students are given the opportunity to ask questions on the assignment. The instructor may in turn focus the attention of the class on what he considers to be difficult spots. These discussions should be kept short to insure having enough time for the aural-oral practice.

AURAL PRACTICE. After the questions have been answered, the students are asked to close their books. The instructor now reads and asks for the translation into English of the basic sentences he has chosen. If the basic sentence is particularly difficult, the instructor may help by telling briefly the situation in the story where the sentence occurs.

MARKING THE BASIC SENTENCES. After the aural practice, students are asked to open their books to mark the basic sentences. The instructor indicates where each sentence is found in the text, explains any modification he has made, and then asks individual students to read the basic sentence in the FL (thus giving the instructor the opportunity to teach correct pronunciation and sentence intonation) and to translate into English. The poorer students, who were perhaps baffled by the sentence when presented aurally, now have the opportunity to translate from the printed page.

ASSIGNMENT OF THE BASIC SENTENCES. The students are asked to concentrate on the basic sentences for the next recitation. They are expected to be able to grasp each basic sentence aurally, to be able to repeat it readily, and to be able to write it when dictated in the FL or when given in English. They should also be able to produce variations of the sentence. The skillful use of variations on the part of the instructor gives him an opportunity to teach grammar functionally.

RECITATION ON THE BASIC SENTENCES. The sentences learned may now serve as the foundation for discussions in the foreign language. Early in the school year, the instructor will ask questions for which the basic sentence may serve as the answer. Later, questions which require some modification of the basic sentence may be introduced. The spade-

work done in developing aural comprehension and oral facility pays rich dividends.

EXAMINATIONS. The basic sentences may well serve as the core of all examinations. It is axiomatic that good examinations parallel as much as possible what is done in class; therefore, the examination may consist of basic sentences to be written from dictation (test of aural comprehension, spelling, and knowledge of grammar) and translated into English, a series of sentences to be translated from English into the FL (these may be basic sentences or variations of them), and finally a series of questions dictated in the FL to be answered in the FL. This type of examination has advantages for both student and teacher; the student appreciates having a definite body of material to study and review for the test, and the instructor has no difficulty in composing the exam.

We have used the above-described methodology with modifications in French, Spanish, and Italian, and have observed classes where it was successfully used in German. Although we have used our procedure exclusively in college classes, we believe that it can also be used with profit at the secondary level. To those who may say that our techniques stress memory work excessively, we would like to quote from H. E. Palmer's *The Scientific Study and Teaching of Languages*: "Learning by heart is the basis of all linguistic study, for every sentence ever uttered or written by anybody has either been learnt by heart in its entirety or else has been composed (consciously or subconsciously) from smaller units, each of which must at one time have been learnt by heart."

JOSEPH A. MASTRONIE

JOHN R. BICKLEY

University of Pittsburgh

* * *

Speaking at Assumption College, Bishop John J. Wright of Worcester said that "perhaps the greatest embarrassment for Americans abroad is that we can't understand and talk with other peoples unless they are willing to learn our language." Citing a statement from St. Augustine that "a man is more at home with his dog than he is with another man whose language he cannot understand," the Bishop commented that "in the presence of a man whose language we cannot speak, we are almost fatally and mutually antagonistic."

* * *

*Experiment in the Teaching of Russian in the Elementary School**

THE current interest in the teaching of modern languages at the elementary and high school levels has gone so far in preparing the way for substantial experimentation in this field that last September the authors of this article had no difficulty in encouraging the teachers in a rural school system (Reorganized R-7 in Jefferson County, Mo.) to teach Russian to all the students (250) in that system from grade levels 3 through 8. The program has now been in progress for five months and the results are sufficiently promising to warrant a description of the process by which this came about and the procedures which are being used in class.

Last summer, while acting as a science consultant to this elementary school system, the senior author of this article recommended that the emphasis on science, important as it was, should not be permitted to obscure the significance of language training in the emerging pattern of educational rehabilitation. The encouraging reaction of the teachers prompted the authors to organize a course in Russian language that could be given at grade levels 3 through 8 to all students. Some of the problems that had to be faced in this attempt were:

- (I) There were no teachers in the school system that knew Russian.
- (II) There was no unscheduled time for this activity in the student's program.
- (III) There are no text books or other aids specially adapted for the teaching of Russian in the elementary schools.
- (IV) The school system had no money available for this activity.
- (V) The reaction of the community—a rural one—to the required learning of Russian on the part of all students was unknown.

The above problems were met in the following way:

- (I) The teachers in this school system agreed to study Russian along with the students. (This

procedure has also been tried by the one teacher in the Potsdam School in New York where Russian has been successfully taught at the third-grade level for a period of two years.) This is, of course, far from the ideal way of introducing a subject, but in the present educational situation, it does have some advantages:

- (A) If the method succeeds, it is a rapid way of producing foreign language teachers for the elementary schools.
- (B) It creates a sensitivity on the part of the teacher to the need for growing along with the newer developments in education.

The disadvantages of this scheme were that:

- (A) It imposed a burden on the teacher's already overcrowded schedule of activities. Very few teachers in the elementary school system have time to learn a foreign language. To compensate for this, only one-half hour of formal language instruction per week was given, although the instruction was scheduled for a period of six years.
- (B) It exposed the student to inadequate pronunciation of the foreign language. This was compensated for by having tapes available of the pronunciation of the words used, and by having a foreign language consultant come in approximately every third week to assist in the class work and review the progress made.

(II) Overcrowding the curriculum was avoided by selecting as the vocabulary studied the subject of arithmetic. This, combined with the fact that formal instruction was limited to one-half hour a week, made it practical to assign this time to that normally devoted to arithmetic.

* EDITOR'S NOTE: Of the two authors reporting on the experiment, the first is an associate professor of physics, the second a superintendent of schools.

The choice of arithmetic as the subject matter basis turned out to be a rather happy one since the vocabulary of arithmetic is highly repetitive and is used over a period of six years at every grade level.

(III) At first an attempt was made to explore the use of a standard first-grade Russian text in arithmetic. In actual practice, this turned out to be somewhat unrealistic since the level of language sophistication in this text is much more difficult than that which can be used in the beginning study of a language. This approach was soon abandoned, and vocabulary lists with translation and transliteration were prepared for each lesson. This is the only printed material being used at this time.

(IV) For the first year, the financial problem has been met by having all people involved in the program donate their services. This, of course, is rather impractical over a long period of time, and other solutions to this problem are being explored.

(V) The community reaction has been no problem at all; in fact it has been a major stimulus in keeping the program going. The parents, the school boards, the local newspapers have been most enthusiastic about the program. (This, incidentally, seems to have been the finding at the Potsdam School in their limited program and in the Salt Lake City program conducted by Mr. Anastasian at the 4th and 5th grade levels as an extra-curricular activity.)

THE PROCEDURES USED

The procedures used in this course are:

- (1) Each new lesson is first presented primarily with an aural-oral approach.
- (2) The class is conducted primarily by conversation around numerical examples. These examples are usually simple numerical problems at the student's level of mathematical sophistication. The student solves these problems mentally.
- (3) After class, the student is given a printed list of words together with their trans-

lation and transliteration. Whenever it is advisable, the teacher writes in both Russian and English words on the blackboard.

- (4) Although one-half hour per week of formal language training is given in this manner, the student is encouraged to use this language in all his classes. This is practical since the teacher in all his classes is also studying Russian.
- (5) In a surprising number of cases, the students report that the parents are learning the language along with them. This gives the student still more practice in the language and also creates an intellectual climate in which the learning of languages is considered a valuable activity.
- (6) Tapes are made available to the teacher with the pronunciation. These tapes contain pronunciation of the Russian words used in each lesson.

FUTURE PLANS

The interest in this activity has been so high that the senior author of this article has been encouraged to give demonstrations of the procedures used in an actual classroom. The grade level which he uses to demonstrate this class is the third, since his experience has shown that the facility of youngsters for acquiring languages at this grade level is remarkably good. It also has the advantage of showing that it is entirely practical to start the teaching of a language at an early age. The very favorable reception that these demonstration lessons received prompted the authors of this article to apply for a grant under Title VII of the National Defense Education Act, to prepare a set of 32 half-hour movies which would enable this program to be carried on in a school system which did not have a Russian language consultant.

ALEXANDER CALANDRA
CHARLES J. MCCLAIN

*Washington University
Festus School System*

* * *

Vouloir, c'est pouvoir.

* * *

Auding Tests

A SIMPLE, quickly scored, and at the same time highly accurate test of the student's achievement would be of great value to the foreign language teacher in reducing the amount of time spent by the students in taking the exam and by the teacher in correcting them. Auding tests fulfill the first requirement. They also seem to be accurate measurements of the student's mastery of the various language skills.

Auding is a language function. It is to hearing what reading is to seeing. Hearing is the all-inclusive term denoting the activity of the ear. Auding differs from hearing in that it concerns itself only with the language signals. It also includes the perception and the interpretation of the spoken signals. It is "the process of listening to, perceiving, and interpreting spoken symbols."

Auding is the first, and maybe the most important of the four language skills, because of its function and its role in the development of other language skills. Deaf mutes, who still have the normal functions of their speech organs, have difficulty in speaking because of their inability to aud. There is a close relation between reading and auding. Auding is the critical faculty supporting and imposing limits upon reading ability. Brown suggests that reading is no more than an extension of the auding process. Similarly, Skinner classifies the reading process, especially for the beginner, as a listening behavior. There is a hierarchical pattern of interdependence among the four faculties of language. Writing, no less than reading and speaking, is directly as well as indirectly influenced by the auditory language. The importance of auding rests upon its vital contribution to the function of the other language skills. An auding test, therefore, may be an accurate measurement of the student's mastery of the other language skills.

Auding is also a habit. There are good readers, who accurately perceive what they read, and poor readers, who read with very limited perception. Likewise, there are good auders:

people who in their own native language are in the habit of carefully listening to and perceiving what the speaker says, while others have poor listening habits. In foreign language study, auding habits become so much more important since the student must learn to differentiate between strange and unfamiliar sounds and structures. An auding test trains the student to pay close attention to these matters.

Auding, especially in a foreign language, is a difficult task. Because of their native habits, students have difficulty in hearing unfamiliar sounds. Mentally they superimpose those sounds with which they have had experience. The foreign intonational system further complicates sound perception in that the unfamiliar tune acts as a cover, hiding the sounds. Structure, which is based on sound, is just as difficult to perceive. The structure words, that is, the little words in the sentence, such as pronouns, prepositions, auxiliary verbs, etc., often consist of a single sound. Students fail to hear the small shifts of sound which indicate major shifts in meaning, such as in "*Il fini*" and "*Il a fini*." The morphology, the system of endings added to the verbs, articles, and adjectives, presents just as much difficulty in perception.

An auding test, of course, could test the student's mastery of vocabulary. He could be asked to identify a specific vocabulary item which he has heard in a given sentence among a number of homonyms which he has in writing on a sheet of paper. This type of test is different from an aural comprehension test in that aural comprehension is not restricted to the knowledge of vocabulary alone but includes the language system. The auding test can be so constructed that it tests merely the hearing and interpreting of a single word.

Mastery of the sound system can be tested. The student is asked to discriminate among minimal pairs, that is words which sound alike except for one sound. He scores the words which he hears.

1. **messe** **masse**
2. **caisse** **casse**
3. **belle** **balle**
4. **rit** **rue** **roue**
5. **pire** **pur** **pour**
6. **vin** **vent** **vont**
7. **bain** **banc** **bon**

The test can be made more difficult by placing the items into sentences:

1. a. Il a pris un bain.
b. Il a pris un banc.
c. Il a pris un bond.
2. a. Il fait du vin.
b. Il fait du vent.
3. a. J'ai vu une belle rue.
b. J'ai vu une belle roue.
4. a. La jeune fille est pire.
b. La jeune fille est pure.
5. a. On paie la caisse.
b. On paie la casse.

The basic language courses stress the acquisition of the foreign structure within a very restricted vocabulary. The learning of a great number of words is of little help in understanding and reading the language if the student has not thoroughly mastered the system of that language. Unless the student knows the system as well as that of his native language, he will have difficulty in auding, reading, speaking, and writing. Once he has acquired the foreign system he will be able to learn vocabulary at a very fast rate.

The auding test is especially suited to test the student's mastery of the syntactical system. The student is told to listen for a particular grammatical sound or structure: for instance, the sounds which constitute the *passé composé*. The question is asked: "Is this particular tense used in the following sentences? Yes or no?" A number of sentences are then read to him, each repeated once with a pause of two to three seconds between them. The student indicates whether he heard the past tense or not by circling a plus or a minus sign. This test was developed for another reason. It is considered poor teaching practice, even in a test, to permit the student to hear an incorrect structure. Only correct structures should be presented.

Such an auding test is much more difficult

than is assumed at first. It is not possible to listen for those sounds which constitute the structure without hearing and interpreting the entire sentence. The student cannot distinguish the particular sound in a stream of sounds, especially when the sentences are spoken at a normal rate of speech, that is, as a native would speak them with all the proper intonations. The sentence length determines difficulty. In the beginning the student cannot keep long sentences in mind for later interpretation. As the student advances in the foreign language, the testing items become longer and longer. The position of the tested items is of importance. The difficulty increases at the rate at which the tested item is placed further back in the sentence.

The following test is an example of an auding test designed to test the language system, and is given half way during the first semester of French.

Le *passé composé*. Did I use this particular tense in each sentence?

1. La Lorraine est devenue un champ de bataille.
2. A Verdun on a trouvé les restes de 300,000 soldats.
3. On a réuni les restes des soldats dans le monument.
4. A Verdun on a construit un monument austère.
5. Le monument rappelle les hommes morts.
6. Dans le cimetière on trouve les restes des soldats.
7. On a réuni les morts dans le cimetière.
8. Les Alliés ont gagné la guerre.
9. Les Américains sont arrivés en 1917.
10. On voit les traces du canon dans les champs.

Le pronom *le*, *la*, *les*. Did I use one of these pronouns?

11. La Lorraine est un plateau. Un fleuve la traverse.
12. On voit une belle place. Une statue la domine.
13. Nancy est une belle ville. On y trouve des places élégantes.
14. On voit des ruines. Les canons ont détruit cette église.
15. On voit des tranchées. Les soldats les ont construites.
16. Voici un monument; les Français l'ont construit.
17. Il y a un cimetière à Douaumont. Il rappelle la bataille de Verdun.
18. Voici la défense française. Le lion la symbolise.
19. Metz est une forteresse. Il est situé sur la Moselle.
20. Voici un monument austère. Il rappelle la Grande Guerre.

The test itself is simple to administer, takes relatively little time to prepare, and almost none to correct. At the University of Florida the student is given a printed form with 20 sets of

plus and minus, one of which he circles. Many variations of this test are possible, although this particular form seems to be the simplest in preparing and correcting.

Auding tests reveal the student's mastery of the foreign language. The sounds and structures which have not been mastered cannot be heard or identified. In testing the auding skill, we get a reliable picture of the student's mastery of the oral skills, that is understanding the spoken language and speaking. Since there is a close relation between auding and reading, the auding test is also an index to the student's reading ability. Results at the University of Florida with some 300 students over a three semester period at the various levels in the basic courses show a close correlation between the auding tests given at the conclusion of each lab session and the various examinations given during and at the conclusion of the semester. Results seldom vary more than half a letter grade, with the results in the auding tests being the weaker.

Our examinations test each of the four skills separately and give each skill equal value. 1. The student reads several pages of print within a predetermined time span. He indicates his reading comprehension by answering questions about the material. 2. Depending on his level, he listens to a long story or several smaller passages

and answers questions about what he has heard. 3. He is asked to record an unprepared discussion about materials or authors which have been studied in class. 4. Finally he writes a composition about an assigned topic. The last two skills, speaking and writing, are graded on the basis of the student's use of structure, its variety and correctness, his vocabulary, his oral fluency, or his written volume, the correctness of his sounds and intonations or his spelling. During the semester we frequently give quizzes in which the student must manipulate structures, that is change a tense, change from the positive into the negative or the interrogative, substitute pronouns, etc.

In some institutions reading and writing a foreign language are postponed until the student has acquired a fair degree of proficiency in the foreign sound system. The audio-oral approach, in general, deemphasizes the writing skill in the early stages of language learning. Foreign language teaching "in the new key" has deprived the teacher of the familiar testing devices and has made apparent the need for objective examinations testing the oral skills. The teacher who is expected periodically to grade his students' achievements will find the auding test a reliable instrument.

THEODORE MUELLER

University of Florida

* * *

The Teaching of Hebrew

Under the auspices of the Jewish Agency for Israel, 16 East 66th Street, New York 21, the noted Israeli linguist and educator, Dr. Mordecai Kamrat, recently reported that for Israel's newcomers, hailing from five continents and some 70 lands, a speedy mastery of Hebrew is practically a matter of life and death. That takes care of motivation. About 100,000 students ranging from teenagers to persons in their sixties have graduated from the sixty Ulpanim now operating in every part of Israel. Though most had no prior knowledge of the language or the alphabet, their average time of study and accomplishment at the Ulpan did not exceed five months or about 600 hours of classroom work. Highlights of the Ulpan approach to language teaching include "use of grammar as an inventory of the language; a new framework for subject centered instruction; exploitation of unconscious elements of learning; new ways of training auditory memory; and the living communications approach to written exercises." Like the young child, Dr. Kamrat believes, the student must acquire a certain amount of ease in oral expression before he can absorb the formal structure of the language in a meaningful way.

* * *

Art, Truth, Morality and the Nineteenth-Century French Novel

THERE is one aspect on the nineteenth-century French novel that has remained relatively untouched: the prefaces with which the authors introduce their works. While the specific purpose and the tone of these prefaces vary widely, the same basic questions always arise, questions concerning the function of the novel and the aim of the novelist.

Just how does the novelist view his function? What is the purpose of writing a novel? Is it to imitate nature as a mirror reflects what is before it? Is it to illuminate nature by the bright light that is supposed to emanate from the author's mind? Is the novelist the creator of a new world never before seen? Or is he merely exteriorizing some overpowering feeling, using his art as a sort of catharsis? Is there any specific function that his art is uniquely designed to fill? Perhaps its purpose is to instruct, in which case the novel would become an adjunct of science or pedagogy; perhaps to correct manners and instill virtue, which would make the novel a tool of some social, religious, or philosophical importance. Or is its primary aim merely to afford pleasure—to enable the reader to while away an amusing or thrilling half-hour?

Chateaubriand's preface to *Atala* and *René*, published in 1805, affords an excellent introduction to the conflicting aims that will become apparent during the course of the nineteenth century. It comes as no great surprise to read that, for Chateaubriand, "L'imagination est riche, abondante et merveilleuse, l'existence pauvre, sèche et désenchantée."¹ This is what we would expect from a pre-Romantic: the author's task is clearly to give free rein to this "marvelous imagination," and not to limit himself to depicting "dry reality." Yet in this same preface, speaking of an incident in *Atala*, he states that it was put in the novel not because he found it artistic, but because it was "une chose malheureusement trop vraie" (p. 11). This is not only the negation of Romanticism,

as the term is generally understood, but it also marks a sharp break with the classically-derived imitation of *la belle nature*. Chateaubriand goes beyond the limits of classical *vraisemblance*, placing himself in the position of the defender of truth and accuracy, regardless of the artistic or moral canons involved. This implicit contradiction is further complicated by the statement that his goal was to "faire aimer la religion et en démontrer l'utilité," as well as to combat the pernicious effects of "ces rêveries si désastreuses et si coupables" that had come from the pen of J.-J. Rousseau (pp. 14-15). These crisscrossing tendencies of realism (the author as a mirror of the universe), of certain aspects of Romanticism (the author as the imaginative creator of a universe peculiar to himself), and of moralism (the author as the guardian of virtue)—these three tendencies are the focal points upon which most of the critical prefaces of the nineteenth century will be based.

For Mme de Staël there are two criteria for judging the value of a novel: its morality and its utility (although she implies that these may well be two aspects of the same goal).² The technique she recommends is one that is ultimately derived from *La Princesse de Clèves*: psychological analysis. The true novel is "une sorte de confession, dérobée à ceux qui ont vécu comme à ceux qui vivront" (p. 220); and later she adds: "Les fictions doivent nous expliquer, par nos vertus et nos sentiments, les mystères de notre sort" (p. 221). Mme de Staël does not refuse reality, but it is more a humanized reality, the *vraisemblance* or *la belle nature* of a previous age, than the realism that was to follow. There

¹ François René de Chateaubriand, Preface to *Atala et René*, 12^e éd., 1805 (Paris: Garnier, s.d.), pp. 9-16. This quotation is from p. 13. All page numbers in the body of the paper refer to the text of the preface being discussed at that time.

² Mme de Staël-Holstein, Preface to *Delphine*, 1802, in *Oeuvres* (Paris: Lefèvre, 1862), I, 219-226.

is no question here of the novel as a work of art, no question of beauty, of eternal truth, of creative necessity. She has two goals: to analyze sentiments and to write a useful book. As a theoretician of the novel, she sums up views widely held in the eighteenth century, views which were shared by Chateaubriand,³ but which were later to be modified and expanded.

While this double goal of the inculcation of some sort of utilitarian morality plus the representation of some sort of reality also appears in De Senancour's preface to *Obermann*, the stress on morality is completely absent from Constant's introduction to *Adolphe*.⁴ The only value that Constant says he sees in his work is "un certain mérite de vérité" (p. 4). This emphasis upon truth recalls Stendhal's prefaces to *Armance*, *Lucien Leuwen*, and *La Chartreuse de Parme*, where he acknowledges that he has held a mirror up to reality, not because he feels that this is the best way to achieve eternal glory, but because it seems to him the simplest way to write a novel.⁵ Stendhal, like Constant, rejects the temptation to utilize the novel for didactic purposes, preferring instead to remain an objective, accurate viewer of the real world about him.

In 1827, De Vigny once again adds the goal of morality to that of reality, and attempts in his preface to *Cinq-Mars* to give this double function of the novel a philosophical twist.⁶ According to him, the mere description of "la triste et désenchanteresse réalité" is unworthy of the name of art (p. 6). The true function of art is to present "le spectacle philosophique de l'homme travaillé par les passions de son caractère et de son temps" (p. 7), that is, to give an idealized, generalized picture of man, his passions, and his milieu. The artist's goal ought to be the presentation of eternal rather than variable truths. Even though the novel may have a "signification morale" (p. 10), one must never forget its "rapports avec [la] BEAUTÉ IDÉALE" (p. 13).

De Vigny may have striven after moral good and abstract truth; not so Victor Hugo, who, in this respect, takes after Stendhal. In his untitled preface to *Notre-Dame de Paris*, Hugo remarks—whether in earnest or in jest it is difficult to determine—that the entire work was

based on the Greek word 'ANÁΓKH (necessity); and in a note added the following year (1832), he claims that his true goal was to resurrect the Middle Ages in their entirety. Yet, thirty years later, he illustrates the growing importance of the social-realistic current in French letters by writing what is perhaps the most forceful brief statement of the century, urging that the novel be oriented toward the accomplishment of social reforms. In this untitled preface to *Les Misérables*,⁷ we see the transformation of Hugo the artist, impelled by necessity to resurrect the past, into Hugo the social force, striving to better the lot of his fellow man—a precursor of Upton Sinclair and his *Jungle*. There is no question here of beauty, either classic or romantic; even *vraisemblance* and accuracy of detail are relatively unimportant. Social injustices undeniably exist, and by blowing them up to more than life size, by using a palette of black and white, the novelist can most effectively make his point. Art, beauty, indeed morality itself (in the narrow sense of the term) can come later, if at all. This is truly a far cry from the Romanticism of parts of Chateaubriand's works, as well as from the realism of a Constant or a Stendhal.

It is rather difficult to pinpoint George Sand's precise views on the function of the novel. It is

³ In the preface to the first edition of *Atala* (1801), Chateaubriand implies that his work is little different from the classic ideal: "Peignons la nature, mais la belle nature: l'art ne doit pas s'occuper de la peinture des monstres." See *Atala, René, Les Natches* (Paris: Hachette, 1901), p. 6.

⁴ Etienne de Senancour, "Observations," preface to *Obermann*, 1804, éd. crit. en 2 vol. par G. Michaut (Paris: Cornély, 1912), I, i-v. Benjamin Constant, Preface to the 3rd ed. of *Adolphe*, 1826 (Paris: Calmann Lévy, s.d.), pp. 1-5. (The first edition of *Adolphe* was published in 1816.)

⁵ Stendhal, *Oeuvres* (Paris: Gallimard [Bibl. de la Pléiade], 1947), 2 vol. Preface to *Armance* (1827): I, 25-27; preface to *Lucien Leuwen* (1836): I, 729-731; "Avertissement" to *La Chartreuse de Parme* (1839): II, 23-24. For the importance of the image of the mirror in literary criticism, see M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953).

⁶ Alfred de Vigny, "Réflexions sur la vérité dans l'art," published as a preface to *Cinq-Mars*, 1826 (Paris: Lemerre, 1883), pp. 1-14.

⁷ Victor Hugo, untitled preface to *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 1831 (Paris: Hetzel-Quantin, s.d.), pp. 1-2. A second preface, entitled "Note" and dated 1832, *ibid.*, pp. 3-6. Introductory note to *Les Misérables* (1862), dated 1862 (Paris: Hetzel-Quantin, s.d.), pp. 1-2.

clear, however, that she tends to stress primarily a moral goal, and only secondarily a realistic one.⁸ As far as realism is concerned, "l'écrivain n'est qu'un miroir" (*Indiana*, p. 14); "il vous dira tout, même ce qui est fâcheusement vrai" (*ibid.*, p. 5). On the other hand, the artist is a responsible member of society and therefore has a goal of moral and social reform, even if this aim is subordinated to the exact depiction of reality (*ibid.*, pp. 6-7). But this is not all. In the preface to *Lélia* she notes that certain passages were added less for social or realistic reasons than in an attempt to "effacer le souvenir des frayeurs" (*Lélia*, p. 7)—a sort of literary exorcism. And in the introductory note to *La Mare au diable*, what is stressed is not the morality or the utility of the work, its revolutionary principles, or even its cathartic function (which she says had nothing to do with this particular novel), but rather its artistic pretensions: she has set out to paint something simple and beautiful. To put it mildly, there would appear to be a certain fluctuation in her goals from one novel to the next (or, perhaps more accurately, from preface to preface). Not that a streak of realism with a utilitarian bent is ever completely absent from the novels of George Sand; it is just that other, more narrowly artistic elements continue to appear, almost as a kind of ornamentation.

Sainte-Beuve, too, had a utilitarian purpose in writing *Volupté*.⁹ In his preface he readily admits that his aim is the description of a vice, but he hastily and sanctimoniously adds that, of course, this does not mean that the book is immoral. The accuracy of the portrayal, he implies, is sufficient to make it a morally valuable work. Years later, this same argument, in slightly modified form, was to serve Flaubert in his defense of *Madame Bovary*.

At about the same time that Sainte-Beuve published *Volupté*, Théophile Gautier was working on his revolutionary introduction to *Mademoiselle de Maupin*.¹⁰ No two prefaces could indicate goals more widely divergent than those of Sainte-Beuve and Gautier: the one repeats the saws of a previous generation, whereas the second launches the first out-and-out attack against those who would have the novel remain the exclusive property of moralists and portrait painters. If we leave aside Gautier's

violent denunciation of the hidebound (if not utterly incompetent) professional critics, there remains one central theme that runs throughout the preface: the hypocrisy of writers who spend several hundred pages describing vices of various kinds, only to turn about insisting that their purpose has been to make men more virtuous. This preoccupation with vice in the concrete and virtue in the abstract Gautier finds rather difficult to defend. For him, a work of art—in this case the novel—must not be judged by standards foreign to it, even though these standards may be theoretically as praiseworthy as the social utility or morality of the work. A work of art may be artistically valuable whether or not it is moral or useful.

In a passage that recalls Voltaire's defense of *le luxe*, Gautier notes that "le superflu est nécessaire" (p. 32), no matter whether it be music, painting, or a novel. "Un livre ne fait pas de la soupe à la gélatine" (p. 28), and it therefore should not be judged on the same basis as that "soupe." To him, the goal of the novel, as well as of life itself, is "la jouissance" (p. 33). To the extent that the novel increases human enjoyment, it is a success; if it does not, it is a failure, despite its utilitarian or moralizing pretensions. For generations, he says, writers have been putting out "moral" and "useful" works, but the same seven deadly sins are still with us. If these novels were to be judged on the basis of their avowed purpose, they would all be declared utter failures. Hence, instead of pursuing a chimerical, unattainable, utilitarian purpose, the artist might more wisely devote his talents to creating carefully conceived works of art designed not to illustrate any political, social or moral code, but simply to please. The fact that Gautier nowhere indicates by what criteria

⁸ See, for example, George Sand, *Indiana*, 1832 (Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1888): "Notice," dated 1852, pp. 1-3; preface to the 1832 edition, pp. 10-16. *Lélia*, 1833 (Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1881): "Notice," dated 1854, pp. 1-2; preface to the second edition, undated, pp. 3-10. *La Mare au diable*, 1846 (Paris: Charpentier, 1891): "Notice," dated 1851, pp. 1-3.

⁹ C.-A. Sainte-Beuve, untitled preface, dated 1834, to *Volupté*, 1834 (Paris: Charpentier, 1890), pp. 1-2.

¹⁰ Théophile Gautier, *La Préface de Mademoiselle de Maupin*, éd. crit. par Georges Matoré (Paris: Droz, 1946), pp. lxxviii, 105. The novel itself was first published in 1835, with the preface dated "mai 1834."

one is to judge the success or failure of such a work in no way invalidates his position, but it does make it extremely difficult to implement his ideas.

As early as 1834, while Sainte-Beuve was being moral and Gautier was proclaiming the amoral doctrine of art for art's sake, Balzac had already conceived the three-part division of *La Comédie humaine*. In 1841 he found a title for the work, and the following year there appeared his "Avant-propos" to the *Comédie*.¹¹ This is neither the first nor, perhaps, the most important of his prefaces, but it is undoubtedly the best known. It is quite clear from even a summary appraisal of the "Avant-propos" that Balzac, who has often been called a crude materialist incapable of rising from the gutter he could describe only too well, might with greater accuracy be termed the foremost idealist of the century. His purpose, as he saw it, was to study "l'histoire oubliée par tant d'historiens, celle des mœurs" (p. xxix). From there he would go on to "surprendre le sens caché dans cet immense assemblage de figures, de passions et d'événements," ultimately to "méditer sur les principes naturels et voir en quoi les Sociétés s'écartent ou se rapprochent de la règle éternelle, du vrai, du beau." He is quick to add that, while he intends to be "vrai dans les détails" (p. xxxiii), absolute realism is not his goal. He wants to be more moral than Nature, to reward the good and to punish the wicked. In this respect, Balzac is not devoid of utilitarian pretensions.

There is only one major innovation set forth in the "Avant-propos." Instead of inventing sentiments, passions, and ambitions, he claims to be more scientific: observation and classification partly replace total reliance upon the imagination. Such a conscious stress laid upon the *document* is what distinguishes this realist from a George Sand or a Sainte-Beuve. The method formerly used by De Vigny and Hugo to resuscitate the distant past is here used to fix the very recent past. The author's goal is scientific description utilizing both the social document and psychological analysis of the individual.

This, of course, with little or no change, is what Flaubert attempted in *Madame Bovary*, *L'Education sentimentale*, *Salammbo*, and *Bou-*

vard et Pécuchet. This is also what the Goncourt brothers tried to accomplish in *Germinie Lacerteux* and in *Renée Mauperin*.¹² What is immediately apparent in the Goncourts' prefaces is their insistence upon the exactitude of their "facts"—an insistence comparable to that of Flaubert in his defense of *Salammbo*.¹³ But despite this resemblance, there is one striking difference: their scientific pretensions were accompanied by overt social and moral considerations which were absent in Flaubert and not quite so doctrinaire in Balzac. Whereas Balzac wanted to describe all of Society, the Goncourts wished to bring into the novel certain classes that had previously received scant attention: the "basses classes" (*Germinie Lacerteux*, p. 6). This, they felt, would not only extend the domain of the novel, but also lead to the betterment of mankind.

From *La Fortune des Rougon* (1871) to *Le Docteur Pascal* (1893), Zola put into practice the theories developed by Balzac and illustrated so well by Flaubert and the Goncourts. There was one innovation, however, Zola claimed that he would no longer impressionistically compile a list of names, dates, and more or less related events; instead, he would attempt to free man in society (i.e., in the novel) in order to study the results, to see what effect the variables of heredity and environment would have upon the individual and upon the family.¹⁴ The novelist thus becomes less an artist than a scientist, a presumably dispassionate observer of his contemporary world. Art enters the picture only to the extent that the *romancier* is capable of utilizing it in the organization of the "facts." The experiment itself is merely the method by

¹¹ Honoré de Balzac, "Avant-propos" (1842) to *La Comédie humaine*, éd. crit. par Marcel Bouteron et Henri Longnon (Paris: Conard, 1912), I, xxv–xxxviii.

¹² Edmond et Jules de Goncourt, Preface, dated "octobre 1864," to *Germinie Lacerteux*, 1865 (Paris: Flammarion et Fasquelle, 1930), pp. 5–7. *Renée Mauperin*, 1864 (Paris: Flammarion et Fasquelle, s.d.): "Préface de la nouvelle édition," dated "ce 24 janvier 1875," signed by Edmond alone (Jules had died five years earlier), pp. 5–6. See also Edmond's preface to the 1st ed. of *Chérie* (Paris: Charpentier, 1884).

¹³ See Gustave Flaubert, letter to Sainte-Beuve dated "Décembre 1862," published as an Appendix to *Salammbo*, 1862 (Paris: Charpentier, 1897), pp. 353–363.

¹⁴ See Emile Zola, *Le Roman expérimental*, 1880 (Paris: Charpentier, 1923), pp. 1–53.

which the novelist will reach his immediate goal: the demonstration of how a given passion acts in a given social environment. The ultimate aim of the Naturalists, however, is much more grandiose. Once the laws governing human behavior have been discovered by the "moralistes expérimentateurs," it will be a simple matter to modify individuals and their environment so as to solve all the social, economic, and political problems besetting mankind.

De Maupassant is somewhat more subtle than Zola. Rather than term himself a moralist, he is content to let the facts in his novels speak for themselves.¹⁵ Yet the novel's function is not merely to be that of a mirror, passively registering everything that occurs; the artist must strive to present the illusion of truth: "les Réalistes de talent devraient s'appeler plutôt des Illusionnistes" (p. 16). In this respect he reminds one more of his *maître* Flaubert than of his contemporary Zola. While all three may lay equal stress upon accuracy, Flaubert and De Maupassant show much greater concern for art and style, less for the social or moral by-products of the novel. In a word, Zola is *engagé* in his art, whereas neither Flaubert nor his disciple is.

Toward the end of the century, especially with Barrès and Bourget, certain disputes which had previously been of major importance tend to receive less attention than before in the critical prefaces. Discussions about *la vraisemblance* and *le vrai*, about art for art's sake, for truth's sake, or for society's sake, are overshadowed by purely didactic considerations. "J'écris pour les enfants et les tout jeunes gens," says Barrès in his preface to *Un Homme libre*,¹⁶ that is, for those who are still capable of profiting by his experience. Barrès, at the age of 27, has the solemn, pompous tone of a much older and declaiming sage, of a man who has already seen everything and who is intent upon passing on his words of wisdom to the coming generation. Speaking of some youngsters who had committed suicide, he complains: "S'ils m'avaient lu, je crois qu'ils n'auraient pas pris une résolution si extrême. Ces âmes délicates et paresseuses étaient évidemment mal renseignées" (p. 2). He considers his novels as a sort of do-it-yourself manual on how to be happy. Starting from the assumption that one shouldn't take

anything very seriously (not even life itself), then borrowing examples from daily life to illustrate his thesis, he goes on to the rather pretentious claim that his work is "appelé à rendre service" (p. 3). His recipe for happiness is a very simple one: "Chercher continuellement la paix et le bonheur avec la conviction qu'on ne les trouvera jamais, c'est toute la solution que je propose" (p. 4).

No goal other than a utilitarian one appears in his preface. Previous novelists had stressed truth or art, an exact picture of the world about us, or a precise, revealing analysis of emotions. With Barrès we have simply a desire to expose and to justify, in fiction, a rather ambiguous path to human happiness. If ever a novelist had a nonartistic, didactic purpose, Barrès—and not Zola—is that man.

Paul Bourget, though ten years older than Barrès, resembles him in a number of ways. In the preface to *Le Disciple*,¹⁷ Bourget considers that the primary purpose of his work is to be useful: to serve and to form the youth of France, "une France rachetée de la défaite" (p. 7). Wearing his most benevolent and serious face, he appears determined to save France from "l'erreur démocratique" (p. 9). Opposed to "le positiviste brutal qui abuse du monde sensuel," equally opposed to "le sophiste dédaigneux et précoce gâté qui abuse du monde intellectuel et sentimental" (p. 13), he urges his fellow countrymen in the direction of the Church or, at any rate, toward some sort of upper-middle-class respectability. He has no use whatsoever for scabrous, perverted writers (probably a reference to Zola and the Goncourts), or for blasé, irreligious intellectuals (like the early Huysmans); but for Barrès he has nothing but praise (p. 13).

It is quite evident that neither Bourget nor Barrès considered literature as an end in itself. For them, the novel's function was not pri-

¹⁵ Guy de Maupassant, *Pierre et Jean*, 1888 (Paris: Albin Michel, s.d.): Preface entitled "Le Roman," dated "septembre 1887," pp. 5-28.

¹⁶ Maurice Barrès, *Un Homme libre*, 3^e éd. (Paris: Perrin, 1889), pp. 1-6. The preface, in the form of a *dédicace*, "A quelques collégiens de Paris et de la province . . .," is undated.

¹⁷ Paul Bourget, *Le Disciple*, 1889 (Paris: Plon, s.d.): Preface entitled "A un jeune homme," dated "5 juin 1889," pp. 5-15.

marily to please, not to be a thing of beauty or a work of art, not to reproduce reality or to extend man's knowledge of himself and of the world, but rather to illustrate certain moral precepts. If the result happened to be artistic, beautiful, or profound, so much the better; but this was a secondary consideration. Of course, there is nothing unique about this attitude on the part of novelists. L'abbé Prévost, to mention only one, expressed a similar view in 1731 when he said in his preface to *Manon Lescaut*: "L'ouvrage entier est un Traité de Morale, réduit agréablement en exercice."¹⁸ A didactic goal has always been with the novel. The fact that the effectiveness of its teaching has often been questioned has on occasion led novelists to increase the amount of sugar coating with which they surround their pill. Yet at the same time, alongside the out-and-out moralists, there have also been those primarily interested in describing reality, as well as those for whom the novel's appeal was above all an aesthetic one.

The complex and widely varying goals that emerge from a study of the prefaces which nineteenth-century novelists included in their works are traceable in large part to the earlier history of the *genre* in France. It must be borne in mind that the novel had no "official" standing as a literary *genre*, even as late as the beginning of the nineteenth century. Theoreticians and aestheticians had set up no fixed canons, no absolute criteria for the novel; there were no "rules" either to be followed or to be broken. Each novelist was free to produce a highly individual work, held in check only by his innate good taste (if any), by his possible desire to conform to earlier models, and by his dependence upon the reading public for the ultimate

acceptance or rejection of his narrative work.

It is therefore quite understandable that the early nineteenth-century novelists, in seeking to justify or defend their writings, should instinctively take shelter behind one or both of the goals recommended for the novel by most eighteenth-century critics and theorists: *le plaisir* and *l'utilité morale*.¹⁹ (All the other critical considerations which the novelists drew upon—imagination, imitation, *le vrai*, *la vraisemblance*, *le beau*, *la nature*, and so on—were part and parcel of the poetic doctrines of the classical age.) But as poets and dramatists became bolder about breaking with the past, so did the novelists begin to reject the established views concerning the function of *their* works. Finally with Gautier (the first of the complete revolutionaries), *art* comes to the fore. He is the first to assume, without the slightest hesitancy or apology, that the novel is indeed a work of art and that, as such, it should be judged by artistic criteria alone. The subject matter itself and the effects that it may possibly have upon the readers' morals are no longer considered to be of prime importance. Shortly thereafter, however, and continuing on to the end of the century, the principal stress came to be placed on the truthful, accurate *reportage* of political, economic, social, or religious problems—although considerations of art and morality were not entirely eliminated from critical prefaces.

HERBERT S. GERSHMAN
KERNAN B. WHITWORTH

University of Missouri

¹⁸ L'abbé Prévost, "Avis de l'auteur," *Manon Lescaut* (Paris: Lemerre, 1878), p. 5.

¹⁹ See F. Vial et L. Denise, *Idées et doctrines littéraires du XVIII^e siècle* (Paris: Delagrave, s.d.), pp. 394-406.

* * *

In a recent study, Professor Menahem Mansoor of the University of Wisconsin explains in some detail a fact, which it is hoped the National Defense Education Act may find means to remedy, that only 23 institutions of higher education in the United States, out of an estimated 1,800, offer courses in Arabic, and only 10 offer degrees in Arabic studies. "It seems reasonable to think," he writes, "that existing departments of Oriental languages would be serving a valuable purpose in inaugurating special two-year programs with the special goal of providing persons—who are likely to work in a government agency or in the Middle-East—with a reasonable fluency in spoken and newspaper Arabic."

* * *

Slavistics and World Literature¹

IT IS quite apparent that comparative literature, general literature and world literature—all subjects whose common denominator is an interest in more than one literature—are beginning to play a more and more important role in our schools and universities. Departments of Comparative Literature, departments of General Literature, Interdepartmental Committees on teaching literature, periodicals devoted to general and comparative studies, associations of comparatists, etc., are in a state of growth that is of particular interest to Slavists.

At the same time, Slavists have a very important immediate problem in the sudden and urgent demand for more study of the languages and the training of more teachers, especially since the entire methodological scope of language teaching is being brought into question. The increasing demands on language teaching and the shift of emphasis in teaching methods present a tremendous challenge to Slavists, as far as literatures are concerned. They must see to it that, on the one hand, the cultural and literary background is not being overlooked in the so-called teaching of languages in the new key. On the other hand, they must encourage the studies on the impact of linguistic patterns on literary forms, which demonstrate the growing importance of a closer cooperation between the various disciplines involved.

As regards the training in literature, Slavists must clarify one of the main issues. Should literary study focus on *Comparative Slavic literature* or on *Comparative literature* as a background for Slavic literary phenomena? They may take their cue from Dmytri Chizhevskii, who provides a partial answer to this seeming dilemma in his fascinating book, *Aus zwei Wellen* (The Hague, 1956), and Roman Jakobson's two articles, "The Kernel of Comparative Slavic Literatures" (*HSS*, I) and "Comparative Slavic Studies" (*Review of Politics*, XVI). While Jakobson rightly points to the impact of common Slavic heritage in folklore and in the lin-

guistic pattern of Slavic literature, poetry in particular, Chizhevskii stresses the importance of wider comparative considerations. He points out what, to be sure, has been pointed out before, that in most cases actual and potential parallels go beyond the boundaries of one linguistic and cultural area and that, on the other hand, the diversities in particular areas may weigh more than the analogies. Thus, in essence, Chizhevskii goes back to the ideas, represented by Alexander Bruckner and others, that studies in Slavic literature should be comparative studies in the widest meaning of this term.

In teaching Slavic literatures in the West Slavists will draw their best comparative illustrations from Western literatures, provided, of course, that these illustrations are familiar to their students. This will lead them to fight for better general literary education in both high school and college in general and for better general literary education of our majors and M.A. and Ph.D. candidates in particular. As classical and modern languages are looked upon as prerequisites for degrees in the arts and sciences, so they will insist that certain courses in general literature and methods of literary criticism be considered prerequisites for degrees in Slavic literature.

Slavists will also contribute increasingly their share to the field of general literature in both departmental and interdepartmental programs. Especially in the realms of the drama, the novel, and of literary criticism, they will find a growing awareness of the need for competent presentation of the most significant Slavic contributions.

They will not overlook in general or in detail what Slavic literatures received from the world or what they gave in return. In all these areas Slavists will need set their sights anew.

ZBIGNIEW FOLEJEWSKI
University of Wisconsin

¹ Summary of a Presidential Address delivered at the Annual AATSEEL Meeting in New York, December 28, 1958.

What Happened to Coleridge's *Wallenstein*

IF IT must be regretfully admitted that no famous translation is (or ever was) less deserving of its repute than the translation of Schiller's *Wallenstein* by S. T. Coleridge (who however did not translate *Wallenstein's Lager*, the merits of which escaped him), it can be shown that admirers of Coleridge have almost as little reason to approve of what has been done to his translation in the years since he made it as lovers of Schiller to be content with the persistent vogue of that translation. On the one hand, we do not have an authentic Coleridge; on the other hand, we are far from having a genuine Schiller. Considering that the bicentennial of Schiller's birth in 1959 is certain to recall him to general attention, the fate of his most celebrated dramatic work in its reputedly adequate English dress cannot be regarded as unimportant.

To begin with, certain well known facts need to be reviewed. Coleridge worked from two MSS prepared especially for him and personally checked by Schiller himself. But then Schiller revised his own text extensively, both deleting and adding, and making some changes in the disposition of acts and scenes in the two plays. In consequence, both Coleridge's text and his scene-arrangement differ markedly from those in the standard German editions of Schiller's trilogy. This could not but strike the friends of German literature as unfortunate, and the editors of the Bohn Library were moved to do something about it. They did two things, basically: they changed the arrangement of acts and scenes to make the translation conform to the German editions; and they added in their own translation many of the lines which Coleridge had not translated because they were not in his copy. Accordingly, there are two "standard" versions of Coleridge's translation, one appearing in Coleridge's published works, the other in Schiller's works printed in English. These relations may be most readily visualized if presented in tabular form.

TABLE 1
ACTS AND SCENES

CW 1834 ¹	BL 1847 ²	S 1872 ³
<i>P</i> I, 1-5	I, 1-5	1-606
I, 6-12 ⁴	II, 1-7	607-1300
II, 1-7	III, 1-9	1301-1912
II, 8-14 ⁵	IV, 1-7	1913-2262
III, 1-3	V, 1-3	2263-2651
IV, 1-7	<i>W.T.</i> I, 1-7	1-663
V, 1-6 ⁶	II, 1-7	664-1279
<i>W.T.</i> I, 1-12	III, 1-12	1280-1785
II, 1-11 ⁷	III, 13-23	1786-2427
III, 1-9 ⁸	IV, 1-8	2428-2914
IV, 1-2	V, 1-2	3203-3384
IV, 3-6	IV, 9-12	2915-3179
—	IV, 13-14 ⁹	3180-3201
V, 1-10	V, 3-12	3385-3866

¹ Coleridge, *The Poetical and Dramatic Works...* "founded on the author's latest edition of 1834 . . ." London, Macmillan, 1880. Vol. 3.

² Schiller's *sämmliche Schriften*, historisch-kritische Ausgabe, ed. Hermann Oesterley. Stuttgart, 1872. Vol. 12.

³ *The (Dramatic) Works of . . . Schiller*. London, Bell, 1887, 1914. Reprinted from Bohn's Standard Library, 1847.

⁴ Scene 6 is in prose.

⁵ Scenes 12-14 are in prose.

⁶ Scene 4 is omitted.

⁷ Scene 3 is partly in prose.

⁸ Scene 9 was deleted by Schiller.

⁹ Scenes 13/14 are not in Coleridge.

The textual situation is considerably more complicated. Coleridge had before him both less and more than Schiller subsequently caused to be printed in the 1800 edition of the trilogy; but he also made a few additions of his own and, particularly in *W.T.*, many deletions. (This in spite of his statement in the preface to the second part, "I have thought it my duty to remain bound by the sense of the original, with as few exceptions as the nature of the language rendered possible.") The Bohn editors, on the other hand, while they took over from the German many lines ("upwards of 250") which Coleridge did not have, still did not give the English reader a complete translation of either play.

TABLE 2
DEVIATIONS FROM SCHILLER'S TEXT

S 1872	CW 1834	BL 1847
P 86-91	---	tr
---	91+6	same
92-7	variant	same
145/6	---	---
204-257	---	tr
306-8	---	---
424-448	---	tr
546-556	---	---
---	836+1	same
915-927	---	tr
1003-10	---	tr
1038-60	---	tr
1061/2	---	---
---	1070+2	same
---	1075+2	same
1090-1112	---	tr
1234/5	---	---
---	1334+1	same
1352-72	---	tr
1443-7	---	---
1476-84	---	tr
1627-31	---	---
1632-6	variant	same
1671-6	---	---
1729-36	---	tr
1801-4	---	---
1859-62	---	---
1868-76	---	---
p. 158	oath ¹⁰	same
2016-21	---	---
---	2126+3	same
---	2148+7	same
---	2167+4	same
---	2180+9	same
---	2213+3	same
---	2233+2	same
---	2446+3	same
---	2542+12	same
---	2613+8	same
---	2635+4	same
W.T. ---	21+6	same
90/1	---	---
115/6	---	---
232/3	---	tr
313-23	---	tr
384/5	---	---
419-43	---	tr
---	447+7	same
459-469	---	---
---	520+5	same
---	541+7	same
---	552+5	same
---	566+3	same
---	596+3	same
---	626+5	same
751-5	---	---

TABLE 2 (continued)
DEVIATIONS FROM SCHILLER'S TEXT

S 1872	CW 1834	BL 1847
761+1	same	
767+15	same	
778+1	same	
779+798 ¹¹	---	---
809+6	same	
833+2	same	
883/4	---	---
903-6	---	---
944/5	---	tr
961-72	---	tr
987-90	---	tr
1422+2	same	
1811+5	same	
1843+6	same	
1895-1902	---	---
2040-2	---	---
2094-2101	---	---
2103-15	---	---
2164+2	same	
2166-70	---	---
2187/8	---	---
2194+6	same	
2231/2	---	---
2379-82	---	---
2429-32	---	---
2448/9	---	tr
2465/6	---	---
2529-31	---	---
2537	---	tr
2887-9	---	---
2914+17	same	
2987/8	---	---
3026/7	---	---
3098/9	---	---
3165-78	---	---
3180-3201	---	tr
3331+2	same	
3448-50	---	---
3454/5	---	---

¹⁰ The next to last sentence, undoubtedly added by Schiller to make the subsequent omission less readily detectable, is missing in CW and BL.

¹¹ It is difficult to understand why the Bohn editors did not add this celebrated speech, beginning "Schnell fertig ist die Jugend mit dem Wort."

Omitted single lines are not included in the table; they are as follows: W.T. 772, 1601, 1868, 2123, 2216, 2396, 2414, 2554, 2718, 2884, 2933, 2990, 3012, 3044, 3047, 3051, 3126, 3136, 3142, 3444, 3624, 3636, 3702, 3800, 3854.

To make matters still worse, all the editions of Coleridge's translation which I have been

able
less
read
few
ridge
seri

B
be c
tion
mist
(alth
somet
"hov
slips
erro
even
wear
ated
mar
wor
exam
repr
1390
stan
I co
1884
ridg
own
occu
as re
(her
as P
from
To
form
olv
in s
wor
bol
P
wer
sky
Kol
(S, 1
Kär
ther
B an
M 1
nob
C M
C M

able to examine are guilty of inexcusable carelessness in the editing and/or printing or proof-reading of the text. I think it safe to say that few readers today have access to a copy of Coleridge's translation which is not marred by some serious errors.

By and large, three types of delinquency can be charged up to all the editors, without exception. (1) They have failed to correct patent mistakes on Coleridge's (or his printer's) part (although all of them present evidence of doing some altering). (2) They have allowed misprint "howlers" to stand, along with many minor slips. (3) They have either made or overlooked errors in punctuation resulting in awkward or even nonsensical readings. In addition, the wearing of the Bohn Library plates has obliterated not only end-line but mid-line punctuation marks and some end-line letters, and some words have disappeared entirely. The worst example to come to my attention is in the 1914 reprint of the Bohn edition, where at line *P* 1390 the words 'How far you dare proceed' now stand as 'How far you.' In the following section I compare readings in Coleridge's *Works* of 1884, ed. by Shedd (here designated as *C*), Coleridge's *Works* of 1880 (Macmillan) based on his own edition of 1834 (here designated as *M*), occasionally the reading in *Coleridge and Keats* as reprinted from the Coleridge edition of 1852 (here designated as *R*), and Schiller's *Works* as published by Bohn in 1847 and reprinted from stereotype plates (here designated as *B*). To save space I give the data in paragraph form, listing in the main errors which either involve meaning or some annoying inconsistency in spelling. Where it seems helpful, Schiller's wording is given in parentheses; the symbol — means a void.

Piccolomini. 4 (S, Donauwerth), *C M* Donauwert; *B* Donauwerth; 17 (S, Terzky) *C M* Tertsky, *B* Terzky; 18 (S, Kolalto) *C M* Kolatto, *R B* Kolalto; 21 (S, Gallas) *C M B* Galas, *R* Gallas; (S, Mansfeld) *C M* Mansfeld, *B* Mansfeldt; 31 (S, Kärnthen, *C R* Kärnthen, *M* Carnthen, *B* Cärnthen; 39 (S, daß . . . was) *C M* that something, *B* and something; 77 (S, —) *C R* hurried voice, *M B* hurrying voice; 109 (S, Herr General) *C M* noble general, *B* hold general; 124 (S, Böhmen) *C M R B* Bavaria; 132 (S, Freund und Feind) *C M* friend and foe, *B* friend or foe; 133. 136

C M Boors, *B* boors; 136 (S, geh'n Bauern drauf,) *C M* ruined,; *B* ruined?; 151 (S, Slawata) *C M B* Stawata; 264 (S, die . . . sich . . . vergriff) *C M* has mistaken, *B* is mistaken; 338 (cf. 21) *C M* Galas, *B* Gallas; 349 (S, nähre) *C M* sustenance, *B* substance; 362 (S, Lützner Schlacht) *C M* at Lützner, *R B* at Lützen; 451 (S, in der Noth) *C M* distress, *B* fear; 461 *C* boods, *M B* books; 469 *C M* devious way, *B* devious path ('path' again in the following line); 608 (S, sie werden . . . erscheinen) *C M* they will be there, *B* here; 624 *C M* eleven is—transgression, *B* eleven is transgression; 686 (S, eignes Feuer) *C* our fire, *M R B* our own fire; 698 (S, Regensprug) *C* Regensprug, *M R B* Regensburg; 736 *C* thou wouldest not have, *M* thou wouldest not have, *B* thou wouldest not now have; 740 (S, mein Vater / Hat nicht gealtert) *C M* my father is not altered, *B* has not altered; 751 (S, flechten) *C M* wreath, *B* wreath; 809 (S, Tyroler Pässe) *C R* Tyrole, *M B* Tyrol; 847 *C M* shift ground, *B* shift round; 850 (S, Oxenstirn) *C M* Oxenstein, *R B* Oxenstiern; 854 *C M* my hand-writing, *B* handwriting; 879 (S, Deodati) *C M* Deodate, *R B* Deodati; 889 (S, unter gleichen Sternen) *C M* like stars, *B* the like stars; 890 *C M* particular aspect, *B* peculiar aspect; 914 *C M* make trial of your luck, *B* try your fortune; 940 *C R* their kinglike leader, *M* king-like, *B* king like leader; 1034 *C M* Oxenstirn, *R B* Oxenstiern; 1119 (S, Thurn) *C M* Thur, *R B* Thurn; 1220 (S, diesen Gustavus) *C* thus Gustavus, *M R B* this Gustavus; 1388 *C M* no ray has broken from him, *B* no ray has broke out from him; 1485 *C M* how long may it be, *B* how long is it; 1550 (S, froh beredt) *C R* joyous, eloquent, *M B* joyous eloquent; 1596 *C* closing-door, *M R B* closing door; 1613 *C M* and that was Venus, *B* Oh that was Venus; 1614 *C M* on the left hand, *B* and the left hand; 1889 *C* you hold your game for one already, *M R B* for won already; 1811 *C M* who thou art, *B* who thou all; 1842 *C M* lives in me., *B* lives in me?; 1908 (S, —) *C R* many a dark heaven, *M B* many and dark heaven; 2042 (S, —) *C M* I tell you, *B* I will tell you; 2127 (S, Quiroga) *C M R B* Quivoga; 2247 *C* where there stands other names, *M R B* stand; 2301 (S, —) *C* see thee wondering on in darkness, *M R B* wandering; 2379 (S, seh ich den Angel) *C M* angle, *B* bait; 2582 (S, Frauenburg)

C Frauemburg, *M B* Frauenburg; 2602 *C M* a part in this thy play— / Thou hast miscalculated on me grievously, *B* play—Thou hast / Miscalculated; 2607 (S, —) *C M* I asked, *B* I ask.

Wallensteins Tod. 8 *C M* and shoots down now, *B* and now shoots down; 26 (S, Geburt der Dinge in dem Erdenschoß) *C M* *B* lord of the secret birth of things is he; / Within the lap of earth, and in the depths; 80 (S, und stell ich Kaution für meine Treu) *C M* and substitute I caution for my fealty, *B* and if I give them caution; 125 *C M* needeth, *B* needed; 147 (S, beschloßne Sache) *C M* it was ne'er resolve, *B* resolved; 184 (S, nicht ohne Schauder greift des Menschen Hand) *C R* not without shudder many a human hand grasps, *M B* may a human hand grasp; 249 (S, Nürnberg) *C M* Nuremberg, *B* Nuremberg; 259 (S, das Spiel) *C M* the gain, *B* the game; 266 (S, Amt) *C M* office, *B* duty; 392 (S, seit der Sesin gefangen sitzt) *C M* no longer since Sesina is a prisoner, *B* since Sesina's been a prisoner; 414 (S, —) *C R* Nay, but bethink you, Duke?, *M B* Duke!; 479 (S, wohl mag's ihm dringend sein) *C M* urgent for him, no doubt;, *B* for him, no doubt?; 572 *C* not for their good wishes . . . indebted, *M R B* not to their good wishes; 626 *C M* opportunity, *B* the opportunity; 647 *C M* poignard, *B* poniard; 706 (S, bin ich willens) *C M* I will to be, *B* I will be; 741 *C M* looking at me, *B* looking upon me (repeats previous line); 854 (S, Frauenberg, cf. P 2582) *C M* Frauenberg, *B* Frauenburg; 1009 (S, Ich—aber / Ihr überrascht) *C* (omits 'I'), *M B* (have it); 1095 (S, Was? Diesen . . . Degen . . . ziehn) *C M* what would you draw this . . . sword, *B* What! Would you draw; 1215 (S, alles . . . was) *C M* all what, *B* all that; 1220 *C M* the single holy spot is now our love, *B* is our love; 1232 *C M* wouldest thou rob me of . . . her sympathy., *R B* sympathy?; 1266 *C M B* Frauenberg (cf. 854); 1267 (S, Toskana) *C M* Toskana, *B* Tsokana; 1283 (S, —) *C R* Why comes this? *M* How comes this? *B* Why, how comes this?; 1384 *C M* he whirls me, *B* he bears me; 1541 (S, gehen wir nach Kärnthen nicht zurück?) *C* Do we not return to Kärn then? *M* Kärn then?; *B* to Carinthia then?; 1569 (S, winkt) *C R B* winks at them, *M* winks to them; 1737 (S, Brünn, Znaym) *C M* Brun, Znaym, *R* Brünn,

Znaim, *B* Brunn, Znaym; 1830 *C M* out of Brüggin in Flanders, *B* out of Brüggen in Flanders, *R* thou art of Brügg in Flanders; 1846 *C M* Nuremberg, *B* Nüremberg (cf. 249); 1862 *C M* Toscana, *B* Toscano (cf. 1267); 1921 *C* Lützen, *M B* Lutzen (cf. 362); 2071 *C M* thinkst thou, that fool-like, *I*, *B* thinkst thou that, fool-like, *I*; 2235 *C* wilt thou attempt a heat with me?; *M R B* me.; 2309 *C M* Think nothing, Thekla!, *B* Think, nothing, Thekla!; 2310 *C M* I did not question thee as Friedland's daughter, *B* I did not question thee, as Friedland's daughter; 2599 (S, Glogau) *C M* Glogau, *R B* Glogau; 2648 (S, Tirschenreit) *C M* Tirschenseil, *R* Tirschenreit, *B* Tirschenreut; 2650 (S, Tachau (*C M* Fachau, *R B* Tachau; 2734 (S, mag werden draus was will) *C M* let come of it what may, *B* come of it what may; 2752 *C M* and kept, *B* and keep; 2757 *C M* straightways, *B* straightwise; 2802 *C M* all come, *B* all comes; 2824 *C M* we've rule, *B* we've the rule; 2831 (S, ihr kommt . . . aufs Schloß?) *C M* you come . . . to the castle., *R B* castle?; 2878 (S, Gewalt, die aus der eignen Wahl) *C M* power, which out of his own choice, *B* its own choice; 3055 (S, wüthende Verzweiflung) *C R* while despair, *M B* wild despair; 3080 *C M* Tirschenreit, *B* Tirschenreut (cf. 2648); 3107 (S, Nachtzeit?) *C M* night-time.; *R B* night-time?; 3289 (S, wann soll er fallen?) *C* when do you propose, *M R B* purpose; 3339 (S, Ingolstadt) *C M* Ingolstadt, *B* Ingolstadt; 3369 (S, Macdonald—Mir ist / Seltsam) *C* Macdonald? / Feel queerly, *M R B I* / Feel queerly; 3480 *C M* what dost thou not, *R M* what! dost thou not (cf. 1095); 3572 *C M* true in this present moment I appear, *R B* true, in this present moment; 3645 *C M* amends, *B* amend; 3667 *C M* Cärnthen, *B* Carinthia (cf. P 31, W.T. 1541); 3699 *C M* as he was frantic, *B* as he were frantic; 3809 (S, habt ihr . . . Auftrag) *C M* order?, *B* order.

Long after the Bohn edition was published, two American re-issues appeared which were put out under favorable auspices. As both were completely reset and had supposedly been carefully rechecked, they might have been expected to offer a correct reprinting of the Coleridge translation with the Bohn scene-arrangement and textual additions. In fact, since what these editors gave the public was not, strictly speak-

ing, the Coleridge translation (and there was considerable editorial revision in details), I think they should have commissioned someone to make the entire text conform to the standard German editions.

Unfortunately, it turns out that both these editions added to the confusion and did further damage to Schiller (and Coleridge) by bringing in a deplorably large number of new misprints and other blunders. I list them here for the benefit of owners and readers of those editions.

The edition of Schiller's *Works* published in 1901 under the editorship of Nathan Haskell Dole includes Coleridge's translation of *Wallenstein* in volume 4. In it I find the following errors. P 348 That I . . . have sulked (read 'skulked') into his graces; 1050 To quicker deaths and (read 'than') hunger and disease; 1392 Here's no heed (read 'need') of full powers and commissions; 1394 What (read 'What?') could I not unriddle; 1396 Why first (read 'just') he, and no other; 1495 The safeguard which the duke had sent us—heavy; / The quietude of parting lay upon me (read 'heavy / The quietude'); 1833 His fame . . . weakened (read 'wakened') . . . no other thought; 1840 Faith (read 'Fate') hath no voice but the heart's impulses; 1841 His present—his alone. / Is this new life, which lives in me? (delete period, read 'me.); 2740 he relies / Upon the (read 'his') stars. W.T. 35 For the heaven's (read 'heavens') journey still, and adjourn (read 'sojourn') not; 62 thee / I punish, or (read 'punish for') thy lies; 209 Whatever (read 'What ever') was, and evermore returns; 366 No, no! my lord duke! it never was (read 'duke! no! it never was'); 388 Far liever would I force (read 'face') about; 398 contents himself with Alstadt (read 'Altstadt'); 502 'twill of itself / Be understood, and (read 'understood that') then the duke retires; 739 must I pluck life (read 'live') asunder from thy name?; 936 do not ride to-day / The dapple, as your (read 'you're') wont; 942 and never more saw I or (read 'of') horse or rider; 1134 Ay! (read 'Ay?') are you sure of that? 1196 the virtuous had retained their influence over (read 'o'er') him; 1261 Will it be always in thy power to follow it. (read 'it?'); 1267 Tsokana (read 'Toskana'); 1297 is no more in nonage (read 'is now no more'); 1486 Oh, is she ill (read 'she is'); 1489 I too must no long (read 'longer')

/ Conceal it; 1553 Is it then true? It is. You are degraded. (read 'is?' and 'degraded?'); 1564 (Wallenstein is given no speech; he should say 'I?'); 1646 Well! (read 'Well?'); 1692 knowest thou already / That old man has betrayed me (read 'already? / That old'); 1711 that which strikes the (read 'this') pang; 1729 the sentinels detain (read 'detained') him; 1830 thou art out of Bruggen (read 'Brügg') in Flanders; 1851. 1860 Olmutz (read 'Olmütz'); 1862 Toscano (read 'Toscana' with Schiller or 'Toskana' as in 1267); 1866 thyself shall (read 'shalt') tell us; 1941 thou leadest (read 'leddest') us out; 1980 that I whisper thee (read 'ye'); 2343 whate'er thou hast (read 'hadst') chosen, thou wouldst still have; 2428 here then he is by (read 'is, by') his destiny conducted; 2703 an "has been" washes out no villainy, / And (read 'villainy! / And') without judgment passed. (read 'passed?'); 2875 hostile occurrences (read 'concurrences') of many events; 2994 these walls breath (read 'breathe') on me; 3128 but think! what (read 'think what') you are doing; 3369 Were it well over—hey, Macdonald! (read 'Macdonald?'); 3429 veiled in thick darkness brings us? (read 'brings for us?'); 2780 hath the whole (read 'sole') power to issue orders.

In volume 3 of *The German Classics* (subsequently edited by Kuno Francke, but to start with by Isidore Singer), which was published about 1913 and devoted to Schiller, *The Death of Wallenstein* is included. This text too is marred by a number of more or less serious errors, as follows: 171 all will be plain (read 'plan'); 729 yet it is good. Is it heaven's will as that is? (read 'good, it is heaven's will as that is.); 961 it awaits (read 'waits') below; 967 then close the doors; keep (read 'doors, keep') watch upon the house; 991 you rejoice (no punctuation, read 'rejoice?'); 1075 few hours / Have past (read 'passed') since he a covenant concluded; 1104 your x sword to 'ts (read 'its') sheath; 1202 simple truth . . . have (read 'had') saved us; 1267 Tsokans (read 'Toskana'); 1478 Go, cheer father (read 'thy father'); 1551 the Emperor's enemy. (read 'enemy?'); 1560 Mine. (read 'Mine?'); 1592 Theresa? (read 'Theresa!'); 1625 he made the bond, and (read 'bond and') broke it not with me; 1646 'Well! (read 'Well?'); 1737 Zanaym (read 'Znaym'); 1738 ta'en oaths (read 'the oaths') of fealty; 1921

Lutzen (read 'Lützen'); 2160 thou cans't (read 'canst') not; 2325 Thekla, / I understand thee (read 'Thekla. / I understand'); 2329 how loved me / And think, too (comma after 'me'); 2383 and his (read 'this') obscure power; 2528 kept me at a distance from him (read 'at distance'); 2611 you saw . . . in the Heaven. (read 'Heaven?'); 2703. 2746 villany; 2826 send out patroles (read 'patrols'); 2827 the watch-word may be altered / At the stroke of ten (read 'altered. / At the'); 2828 At the stroke of ten; deliver in the keys (delete semicolon); 2977 not as a (read 'the') woman, but the heroine; 3102 him who is no more? (period for question mark); 3163 my only hope / To die beneath the hoofs (read 'my only hope! / To die').

Coleridge's work as translator has been carefully and thoroughly examined by Paul Machule¹² and Hans Roscher,¹³ who was apparently ignorant of Machule's article. No attention, I think, has been paid to the passages added in the Bohn edition; but since most readers are likely to ascribe them to Coleridge (and in the

Dole and *German Classics* re-issues these passages are not marked as additions), it seems desirable to scrutinize them. In the Preface to the Bohn edition we read, ". . . the Publisher considers it advisable to . . . add, in brackets, all those portions (upwards of 250 lines) which have hitherto been omitted. [Table 2 shows how far short of perfection in this regard the Publisher fell.] For these G. F. Richardson, the translator of the poems of Körner, is chiefly responsible."

While the Bohn additions are seldom downright false they are often imprecise and consequently do full justice neither to Schiller nor to Coleridge; Richardson himself, who must have been responsible for many of these faults, I know to have been a respectable but not superior translator, and certainly he was not poetically gifted. I will set down below some typical cases and the worst actual errors.

¹² *Englische Studien*, 31 (1902), 182-239.

¹³ *Die Wallensteinübersetzung von S. T. Coleridge*. Leipzig 1905 (the centenary year of the poet's death).

Schiller, *Piccolomini*

209 Sie kümmere nur die Pflicht
(Read 'concern')
212 dreyßigtausend
218 schirmen
(Read 'guard')
251-3 Erschaffen erst / Mußt' es der Friedland, er empfing
es nicht, / Er gab's dem Kaiser!
("Twas Friedland / Who had to build it, He did not receive it, / He gave it to the emperor!")
438-41 Mit jeder Kraft dazu ist er's . . .
(The question form weakens Max's defence.)
442/3 So kommt's zuletzt auf seine
Großmuth an, / Wie viel wir überall noch gelten sollen!
(Then in the end it lies with his great soul / How much of power the rest of us shall wield.)
447 so sind sie!
(Max's third personal form is less offensive.)
448 ihnen nirgends wohl
(Read 'happy')
924 entschloßner That
(Read 'resolute')
926 Das geziemt sich, / Eh' man das Äußerste beschließt.
(To wait is meet, / Before one reaches the extreme resolve.)
1042/3 sah man jetzt / Die Festigkeit der Kühnheit wider-
stehn
(one saw / How fortitude withstood the rush of boldness)
1055 kein glücklich Auge
(Read 'happy')
1095 und wirklich
1352 geschieht
1354 werden . . . bringen lassen

Bohn

Be duty, sir, your study
twenty thousand
hold the fortresses
He, Friedland it was, who called it into being, / And gave
it to his sovereign—but receiving / No army at his hand.
Is he not endowed . . . ?
So then it seems to rest with him alone /
What is the worth of all mankind beside!
Thus are ye ever.
safe
bold act
There's time before / The extremity arrives.
was shown / How fortitude can triumph over boldness
no mortal eye

might take place
would . . . be led

Schiller, *Piccolomini*

1362 Ich denk' es schon zu karten
(I think to deal the cards)
1365 soll ihn verführen
(Read 'shall')
1366 den sie . . . ihm nicht verzeihn
(which they will not forgive him')
1372 ---
(Schiller doesn't say that.)
1483 an der Stunden Wechsel denken muß
(Compulsion is the point.)
1729 Wir haben uns gefunden, halten uns
('We've found each other, hold each other fast')
424 die Treue

Wallenstein's Tod

(Read 'fidelity')
425 ist
426 als ihren Rächer fühlt er sich geboren
('He feels he's born to act as its avenger')
429 was noch so wüthend ringt, sich zu zerstören
(No 'evil' is necessarily involved.)
443 Nutzen
(Read 'utility')
945 aus den tiefsten Quellen
(The nature of the sources is not indicated.)
966 sich niemand zeigen, bis ihr klingeln hört
(Octavio does not expect to use the bell.)
970 Kalkül
(Read 'calculations,' i.e., as to human reactions.)
2448 euch
(Butler and Gordon are not well acquainted.)
3185 Ihnen
(The equerry would never say 'thee' to the Princess.)
3189 Wo geht die Reise hin?
(The 'But' is impossible.)
3190 Wohl, ich geh' es zu besorgen.
('Good, I go to get things ready.')
3195 brauche Ruh
(Read 'need')

Errors or ineptitudes not mentioned above occur in the following lines: *P* 87, 222, 239/40, 424-33, 1009, 1040, 1046, 1047-50, 1053, 1060; *W.T.* 971, 988, 3180.

Though I stated at the outset that Coleridge's translation never merited the repute it actually enjoyed, I should be the first to acknowledge the fine qualities it does possess. Coleridge responded warmly and authentically to Schiller's dramatic fervor, and he adopted Schiller's drama, as it were, and made it his own. Whole passages have the sweep and fire of original creation, and any reader who could not follow Schiller's text, or who did not make detailed comparisons, might easily be persuaded that here was one of the great translations.

Bohn

The object I've in view
will tempt him
which . . . can ne'er be pardoned
To change their chief
who can descend to count the changing hours
We now have met, then let us hold each other
true faith

must be
his nature prompts him to assert its rights
and all the struggling elements of evil
policy
source of destiny
and when the signal peals
well laid plans
thee
thee
But whither
So;—I leave you to get ready.
want repose

The Bohn editors had the right idea, but it seems to me that they did not carry it far enough. I believe that the translation is worth being salvaged, and if the bicentennial flurry leads to a renewal of interest in Schiller as seen by Coleridge, and to such a revision as will make Coleridge's *Wallenstein* a fit partner for Schiller's *Wallenstein*, the benefit to both English and German literature should be considerable and lasting.

BAYARD QUINCY MORGAN
Stanford, California

Notes and News

Research in Lexicography

Many bilingual dictionaries are appearing these days, compiled or revised by persons who seem to think that their only task is to list the entries in alphabetical order without responsibility for any other aspect of lexicography and even without concern for listing phrases, sentences, and separated compounds (like, for example, *high school*) according to a uniform alphabetical method.

Never has there been greater need for understanding among men, and therefore, for reliable definitions of words and phrases and reliable equivalents of words, phrases, and constructions in other languages. Never has there been greater need for thorough lexicographical research.

This research should have the following ten objectives:

- (1) the discovery of lexical phenomena of value to monolingual and bilingual lexicography (see, for example, the findings of Richard D. Abraham in "Fixed Order of Coordinates—A Study in Comparative Lexicography," *MLJ*, XXXIV [1950], 276-287, and of James E. Iannucci in *Lexical Number in Spanish Nouns with Reference to their English Equivalents*, Philadelphia, 1952);
- (2) the development of new lexicographical techniques (see, for example, the proposal of James E. Iannucci in "Meaning Discrimination in Bilingual Dictionaries: A New Lexicographical Technique," *MLJ*, XLI [1957], 272-281);
- (3) the establishment of principles of definition for monolingual dictionaries and the revision of commonly accepted definitions;
- (4) the establishment of standards for equivalents in bilingual dictionaries and the search for better equivalents (for example, should a colloquial word be simply glossed by a literary word if no colloquial equivalent can be found or should the literary word be accompanied by some elucidation?);
- (5) the collection of neologisms, their definition, and the search for equivalents in other languages;
- (6) the improvement of etymologies;
- (7) the dating of the first occurrence and the period of the active use of words and meanings (as Martín Alonso has done in his monumental *Diccionario encyclopédico del idioma*, Madrid, 1958);
- (8) the study of the history of lexicography (particularly in the last 100 years);
- (9) the determination of the current status of lexicographical research and development;
- (10) the review of current dictionaries of all kinds.

Once sound progress has been made in such research and substantial principles have been established, better dictionaries will be compiled and men will understand each other better.

EDWIN B. WILLIAMS

University of Pennsylvania

A Guidance Counselor Looks at Languages

The effective development of language personality and character in the school is hampered by certain obstacles. Understanding the language student requires great insight into emotional and social factors of development. Lack of cooperation between home and school severely limits the successful influence of language education. There is not enough use of outside agencies, such as social workers, mental health clinics, and trained guidance groups; there is a dearth of linguistically-trained workers. Lack of time is another serious drawback to the solution of language personality problems. The language teachers themselves often need help to overcome their personal disturbances, and so cannot aid others in developing well-adjusted personalities. We need more psychological workers, but budget-wise, we are getting buildings instead. The language teacher may recognize the causes of poor character development, but be helpless to remedy the situation, particularly if a broken home is the root of the problem. Even if the parents and the language student can be made to realize their problems, it is quite another thing to persuade them to accept "outside interference."

In order to facilitate and speed up personality training in the language classes, we would suggest a program of teacher indoctrination conducted by the administration

and guidance staff. In order to do this successfully, the following ten principles should be introduced, discussed, and demonstrated to broaden the faculty outlook and improve techniques.

1. Elementary as well as secondary language teachers must be keenly aware of the necessity of the pupil's *early* emotional and social adjustment.
2. Behavior deviation in the language class may appear to be minor, but in reality be a sign of deep-seated disturbance.
3. Motivated group discussion may well be a valuable adjunct to individual practice, but can never replace it entirely.
4. Many forms of delinquency and maladjustment can be traced to reading problems in any language.
5. The language teacher should be cognizant that she needs expert help in solving many behavior and learning problems.
6. The language teacher's mental attitude is reflected in her pupils.
7. A sense of humor and a love of children are requisites for all successful teaching.
8. Secondary language teachers should respect and admire elementary teachers, for the latter build the well-

adjusted, solid foundation on which all education is based.

9. Emotionally-disturbed high school language students may trace their problems back through many years.

10. Every language teacher must be alert at all times to prevent, detect, and help solve social, emotional, personal, and educational problems.

Guidance counselors can do little to help the students, unless the teachers themselves are capable and prepared to help them.

MARGARET S. GANTS

*Johnson Regional High School
Clark, New Jersey*

Pennsylvania Polish Festival

On the eve of the millennium of Polish Culture you and your friends are most cordially invited to come to Pennsylvania next summer, and enjoy the PENNSYLVANIA POLISH FESTIVAL. It will run from Friday, July 31st, through August 9th, and will be held in two places.

The Festival will begin at ALLIANCE COLLEGE, in the beautiful resort area of the northwestern part of the state, at Cambridge Springs, just twenty-five miles south of Erie. This part of the Festival will be in celebration of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Poland's great romantic poet, Julius Slowacki (1809-1849). Already Alliance College has published a memorial brochure in honor of Slowacki. It is entitled LECHITICA, and deals with the brilliant use which Slowacki made of folklore in his drama BALLADYNA, which has been called "A Polish Macbeth." Some time during 1959 a translation of the play, which is a full five acts in length, will be published, and the 1959 issue of *Alliance Journal* (Vol. X) will be devoted to the poet. The brochure LECHITICA may be obtained from Alliance College at one dollar per copy.

The Festival at Alliance College will open with a concert on Friday evening (July 31) by Harriet Aleksander, one of the most popular and active artists of the Southwest, and at present choral director of the Paderewski Society of Phoenix, Arizona. There will be an address of welcome, and a discussion of Slowacki's place in the literature of Poland and of the world.

On Saturday Professor Zbigniew Folejewski, of the Slavic Department of the University of Wisconsin, will give an address on "Slowacki and the Problem of Crime and Punishment." Professor Folejewski is a recent President of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages.

No Polish Festival would be complete without a good deal of brilliant dancing, and this will be supplied by two groups from Youngstown, Ohio, who will build their program around a script prepared from the play mentioned above, BALLADYNA. Also, the CANADIAN GROUP, well known here for their magnificent performances in the past at the Mickiewicz Festival in 1955 and again at the Sienkiewicz Celebration in 1956, will again appear. Mr. T. H. Glista of Port Credit, Ontario, will again lead the Canadians.

On Saturday afternoon, August 1, there will be lectures and round table discussions of the poet to be honored, and plans will be made for honoring him permanently, with a further series of publications, all dedicated in general to the approaching THOUSAND YEARS OF POLISH CULTURE (960-1960). A high point of the Saturday celebration will be a Polish Ball in the evening, at which the scintillating Chojnacki dance group from Buffalo will entertain.

On Sunday August 2, Mass will be held in St. Anthony's Church, with the Reverend Edmund Cuneo, OSB, Director of Development of St. Vincent's College, officiating. Impressive church music will be provided by Professor James Tavolario of Youngstown, and his wife, Mrs. Jean Tavolario, a soloist of note. Professor Tavolario is composing a musical setting for one of Slowacki's charming lyrics, a Christmas carol never before set to music. Mr. and Mrs. John Sidwa of Newark, N. J., will assist with the choir, and will themselves sing.

On Sunday afternoon there will be a concert by Mr. Emil Markow, who was so well received here when he appeared at the College in the spring of 1958. Both Mr. Markow and Mrs. Aleksander will, of course, present programs having to do with the Slowacki theme.

All lectures and in fact the whole program, except for a folk song to be conducted by Mrs. Helen Orze of Youngstown, leading contributor to the quarterly *Polish Folklore*, will be in English, so that all may join in and get the very most out of this rare, three-day cultural treat.

August 3rd and 4th will be left for golfing, fishing, and general recreation in Western Pennsylvania's famed areas in Crawford County and Greater Erie, including the Presque Isle Peninsula opposite Ontario.

PART TWO of the Pennsylvania Polish Festival will take place at Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, under the sponsorship of WILKES COLLEGE. Here the program will continue with the members of the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs (A.C.P.C.C.) as guests of honor. President Eugene Farley of Wilkes College, aided by a distinguished Trustee-Citizens Committee, is preparing a further program dedicated to Polish Culture.

At present A.C.P.C.C. has member clubs, besides at Cambridge Springs and Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania in the following localities: Cleveland, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan; Michigan City, Indiana; South Bend, Indiana; Chicago, Illinois; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Minneapolis and Saint Paul; besides Newark, New Jersey and Rochester, New York. The national President is Professor Vincent Wagner of Notre Dame University.

With the active interest of the many thousands of Pennsylvanians of Polish extraction and their friends, the organizers hope eventually to rival such colorful national events as the famous Dutch TULIP FESTIVAL at Holland, Michigan. They expect tourist guests from every state in the Union.

For invitations and further information please write NOW to:

Dr. A. P. Coleman, President
Alliance College
Cambridge Springs, Pa.

Book Reviews

DOSTERT, LEON, *Français, Premier Cours*. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1958, pp. xii + 469. \$4.95.

This elementary French grammar is the first in a projected series of three texts, and is to be followed by a volume offering an introduction to the life of France and her cultural heritage. A third volume will emphasize refined points in stylistics, partially based on masterpieces of literature. Similar series are planned in German and Spanish. We are told by the publishers that these texts will place all foreign languages in the curriculum on the same level with regard to course content and methodology. The idea of such regimentation may not appeal strongly to many teachers of modern foreign languages, but we need at present concern ourselves only with this first volume in the French series, while deferring our judgment on the value of conformity.

Français, Premier Cours is designed for use either in a one-year college course or in a two-year high school course, and the arrangement of the book would make either possibility quite feasible. The method followed by the author is based on the structural approach, but there is provision for reading and writing skills. The volume is accompanied by audio-visual aids. The audio aids consist of tape recordings made by natives. There are several of these for the section on pronunciation besides a single recording for each lesson. (I have not heard these recordings.) The visual aids consist of 12 "situational wall charts," which are reproduced on a smaller scale in the text to permit students to use them during preparation of the lesson. Each chart is the basis of two lessons in the text, which is divided into two parts of 12 lessons each. Thus the first chart is connected with Lessons I and XIII, but in the latter the dialogue inspired by the picture is considerably more advanced than that used in the first lesson.

A section on pronunciation, entitled "Phonology," occupies the first 21 pages of the book. Here Dr. Dostert uses a system of transcription which differs in some respects from the international phonetic alphabet. Whereas the majority of the symbols conform to this alphabet, we find surprising exceptions, such as /w/ for the sound usually represented by [ɥ], and also a rather complicated system of underscoring and dots to represent sentence stress. The value of offering minor variations to standard phonetic script seems questionable, and the underscoring, dots, + signs etc. often make the script difficult to interpret. The author states that students are not to learn the transcription system for purposes of writing, but only in order to read. However, it would hardly be possible for the teacher to ignore this script in teaching pronunciation, since the tape recordings for this section of the book are based upon it.

Each lesson begins with a dialogue in French on the left-hand side of the page, accompanied by an English translation on the right. This is followed by a list of "expressions utiles," which have already occurred in the dialogue. Next we find a reading section, various exercises, a passage in English to be translated into French, and finally a section explaining the grammatical constructions already used. This approach has the disadvantage of scattering such rules as those for the definite article over several widely separated lessons, and some rules are found only in footnotes. The author is not always consistent in his emphasis on grammatical points: the complicated uses of the verb *devoir*, for example, (p. 263) are given rather summary treatment, whereas an inordinate number of exceptions are mentioned in the discussion of the use of prepositions with the names of countries, cities etc. (pp. 276-279). The imperfect and pluperfect subjunctives are omitted entirely, but this may be justified by the fact that the present volume is so extensive that no supplementary texts, where the student might encounter these tenses, are likely to be used. The wisdom of using such terms as "pronominal" or "intrinsic pronominal verbs" instead of the simpler term "reflexive" is open to question, and some of the technical expressions employed in the "Summary Reference Grammar" at the end of the book might prove difficult for the average elementary student.

These reservations having been noted, we can go on to point out the many excellent qualities of *Français, Premier Cours*. The dialogues which open each lesson are unusually well devised, and introduce in the guise of everyday conversation a large number of current idiomatic expressions. The exercises are uniformly good and seem to conform admirably to the stated objective of the author: "to impart active, practical skill in the use of the spoken and written word." It is worth adding that the book is pleasing in appearance, and that typographical errors are at a minimum. *Français, Premier Cours* should be a success among teachers of elementary courses, who can undoubtedly adapt its approach to suit their own method and who cannot fail to enjoy the fresh and appealing dialogues and exercises.

WILLIAM M. SCHUYLER

University of Illinois
Chicago Undergraduate Division

ARRATIA, ALEJANDRO, and HAMILTON, CARLOS D., *Diez cuentos hispanoamericanos*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958, pp. xii, 187. Price \$2.75.

Here is an excellent miniature anthology of modern Spanish-American short stories; it contains ten stories, well chosen for intrinsic interest. They form a comprehensive panorama of representative authors, styles and themes

from Ricardo Palma to Jorge Luis Borges and Arturo Uslar Pietri. All are recognized master-*cuentistas*, yet the hackneyed has been avoided, while narrative and artistic interest is high and twentieth-century writers often neglected in such collections are included.

Arranged chronologically, the stories are designed to show the development of the literary form and to introduce the student to some aspects of life in Spanish America." The book's purpose as so stated is admirably fulfilled. The introductory sketch preceding each story effectively puts the author in his literary and human place for the student. The initial four-page "Introducción: El cuento en Hispanoamérica," although skeletonsque, is quite comprehensive, considerably enhancing the usefulness of this text as a study guide for the literary currents. Indeed, the book's greatest utility might well be to provide the short-story readings in a university course on modern Spanish-American literature, together with a few other volumes to represent other literary forms; or possibly together with material on the essay, for instance, for a more specialized one-semester course on these two forms. It contains notes (at the end of each chapter) and an amply comprehensive end vocabulary. Exercises after each story consist of questions on content (in Spanish), a list of *modismos* to be used in sentences and 20 English sentences to be translated to Spanish, these last (in particular) probably of little interest for a literature course.

The teacher is likely to ask whether this volume may be suitable for reading in his intermediate courses, the second year in college, for example. The exercises accompanying each selection point toward such a level rather than that of the advanced literature course, and a recent advertisement for the book indicates "designed to introduce the second-year student . . .".

As for subject matter interest, there would seem to be no great problem. This reviewer feels obliged to express some doubts, however, as to the difficulty of the style in about four or five of the ten stories of this collection. However excellent the stories are, a number of them contain complexities of vocabulary, idiom or composition which seem likely to elude or completely baffle all but the exceptional in-between student.

The sparkling Palma story, for example, will probably be confusing for the third or even fourth-semester student because of the way Palma wanders through details to get his story under way and then brings it to a close: a digressive little story-within-a-story in the last page, and certain paragraphs indulging in an exuberance of rare, specialized words (e.g., *marimona*, *arirumba*, *capulies*, *nisperos*, etc., p. 6) are contributing factors. The Delgado story is affected with an exuberance of *americanista* vocabulary, especially in its initial description. The Darío tale is, of course, full of esthetic, descriptive-enumerative vocabulary and allusions to French writers or artists and whatnot. The Borges story especially, which we admire on artistic grounds, seems difficult for the second-year student to seize or appreciate fully due to subtle details and nuances of atmosphere, plus certain epithets such as that opening the story: "Le cruzaba una cicatriz rencorosa: un arco ceniciente y casi perfecto que de un lado ajaba la sien y del otro el pómulo." (p. 105).

It is a pity that the very details which delight a mature

reader are those which cause most trouble for the intermediate student. Superior classes on that level will have no great difficulty. Nevertheless, a word of caution seems advisable to the instructor of average groups. If he would omit the more difficult stories for his intermediate students, he has only five or six left.

The attractive, well-edited paperbound edition seems almost free of mechanical defects. "Conde de Lucanor" for "Conde Lucanor" and "permite el autor" for "permite al autor" on page ix, plus "un ventana" for "una ventana" (page 43) were the only typographical errors this reviewer noticed. One note seemed inadequately explained for the student, that for "el cigarro pateador" and "la mula Maud" in Quiroga's story, "Nuestro primer cigarro", page 55.

JAMES WILLIS ROBB

The George Washington University

MUELLER, HUGO, *Deutsch, Erstes Buch*. Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1958, xi+422 pp. and 11 picture pages.

This volume is one of a new series appearing under the joint editorship of Professors L. E. Dostert, H. G. Doyle, and H. J. Mueller, who also sign as the authors of an accompanying pamphlet entitled "Suggestions for the Use of MODERN SERIES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES". The latter is in the nature of a 'manifesto' which relates the authors' theories to the practice adopted in the volumes of the series.

The basic claim made for the new series is that the approach to the languages dealt with "is structural, descriptive rather than prescriptive, and that it is based on the results of linguistic research" (Manifesto, p. 2). Accordingly a number of the traditional stand-byes of grammatical terminology, such as 'masculine,' 'feminine,' 'neuter,' and 'gender' have been eliminated from the main body of the book, but strangely enough they make their reappearance in an appended Reference Grammar (pp. 334-388). On the other hand, as early as on page 151, the student is treated to both 'subjunctive' and its German rendering *Konjunktiv*. If the grammatical terminology has to be double-barreled, the term which has long been adopted in most textbooks published in Germany, viz. *Möglichkeitsform* would have been preferable, since, while it is not an ideal description of the function of the form either, at least it has the advantage of being better suited to its use in independent clauses.

"The results of linguistic research" as applied to a particular feature of German grammar may be observed in the treatment of the so-called *da*-compounds. On page 125 we learn that "instead of the pronoun *es* after a preposition, the form *da*- plus preposition is used." On page 349 we are further informed that "instead of neuter [sic] dative *ihm* and neuter [sic] accusative *es* (in reference to inanimate objects) after prepositions, one drops the pronoun and uses the preposition with a *da*- prefix added to it." According to this, a native speaker of German is supposed to say: *Ich denke an ihn* (i.e. *den Vorfall*), and *Ich denke an sie* (i.e. *die Angelegenheit*, *die Vorfälle*, *die Angelegenheiten*), or *Ich spiele mit ihr* (i.e. *der Idee*), and *Ich spiele mit ihnen* (i.e. *den Ideen*, *den Gedanken*), since none of these sentences involves *ihm* or *es*. But as a rule he will say *Ich denke daran*

and *Ich spiele damit* instead, which is in line with what another manual published at about the same time as the volume under review has to say on this subject, viz. "Personal pronouns are seldom [the spacing is the reviewer's] used with a preposition when the pronoun refers to a thing or things; *da-* is combined with the preposition instead. Compare the older English forms *thereby*, *therefrom*, *therewith*, etc." Incidentally, the reference to a corresponding older English usage helps to render the German construction more familiar to English speaking students, and its omission from the volume under review is hardly consistent with another claim made in the manifesto, viz. "The authors have proceeded from a structural analysis of English and a corresponding analysis of the foreign language to a comparison of the two. Such a procedure enables one to see the areas of identity, similarity, and difference between the languages" (p. 3).

Equally as important as the grammatical 'descriptions' or 'prescriptions,' if not more so, is the usage underlying the texts by which the student is to be introduced into the foreign language. The authors of the manifesto assert that "all the languages with which we are concerned have developed a standard speech which is used by educated speakers in the entire speech community, notwithstanding the area from which they come" (p. 11). In the absence of any indication as to which languages the series will comprise it is hard to estimate how sweeping the generalization is which that assertion implies. It is surprising that in a volume of such bulk as the one under review no space should have been devoted to familiarizing the student with the peculiar linguistic situation prevailing in the German speaking countries. As a result of this situation the individual speaker there is less sure in the use of standard speech than members of most West European language communities. Some master the standard speech others bungle it, which presents the textbook compiler with a choice: he can base the reading pieces and examples on the best usage, or on the worst, or he can try to steer a middle course.

To determine the type of German usage represented in the volume under review three specimen sentences have been selected at random from page 174: (a) "Von den Geldern wird das gesamte Rundfunk- und neuerdings auch Fernsehwesen getragen." (b) "Ich möchte diesen Brief per Einschreiben schicken." (c) "Wieviel Porto muß ich auf diesen Luftpostbrief kleben?" It is true that sentence (a) could easily be found in print. Moreover, there are Germans who would utter (b) and (c) without hesitation. Yet all three are of a kindred character with the samples contained in a collection recently edited in book form by Dolf Sternberger, Gerhard Storz and W. Emanuel Süskind under the title *Aus dem Wörterbuch des Unmenschens* (Hamburg 1957). Why? Ad (a) *Geld trägt höchstens Zinsen, es kann aber nicht Kosten tragen; ich trage sie, du trägst sie, das Geld jedoch kann es nicht. Mit Geld kann aber etwas erhalten werden*, hence "Mit (or aus) diesen Geldern wird das gesamte Rundfunkwesen usw. erhalten." Ad (b): no sensible person will object to the borrowing of words from another language, dead or living, provided they fill an existing gap. But how does *per*? The use of *per* in the sentence quoted outdoes even the worst usage which gen-

erally employs it only before substantives proper, e.g. *per Bahn, per Jahr, per Adresse*, etc. Moreover, its use is absolutely gratuitous in the sentence under consideration as it is a good deal simpler and more natural to follow those Germans who under the circumstance would say "Ich möchte diesen Brief eingeschrieben senden." Ad (c): leaving aside the objections to the word *Porto* itself, all but the most uneducated Germans know that it signifies a fee collected or a charge made by the postal authorities for carrying (Lat. *portare*) letters, parcels, etc., and thus cannot be affixed to an envelope, wrapping, etc. Hence, if *Porto* it must be, let the students say as do thousands of Germans every day in hundreds of post offices: "Wie hoch ist das Porto für diesen Luftpostbrief?"

It would therefore seem that in the volume under review a type of usage has been adopted which represents German in its worst state of *Sprachverwilderung*. It is a pet idea of the 'leave your language alone' school of applied linguistics that the 'abusus,' as the normative grammarians and purists call it, really is a manifestation of the 'drift' (unfortunately Sapir could not escape being misunderstood any less than Freud), and that the solecisms of today will be the accepted usage of tomorrow. If modern linguistics in this country were not so preponderantly oriented toward the synchronic and operational aspects of language, the fact would not be so readily overlooked that only a relatively very small number of solecisms and barbarisms eventually attain the status of accepted usage. From their close association with anthropologists modern linguists ought to have learned to observe that in highly civilized societies there are also taboos in matters of language, and not all of them only proscribing certain words. Normative grammarians in a way do nothing but set up taboos of a special kind in accordance with a system which in most European languages is of the nature of a fetish, being part and parcel of the much revered Graeco-Roman heritage.

Since so much is being made nowadays of the necessity of understanding other nations, and respecting their customs and institutions, great pains should be taken to familiarize the students with the grammatical and lexical taboos of the nations whose languages they are learning. In the volume under review more than two pages are taken up by a *Lesestück* entitled *Tischsitten* (pp. 324 f.), acquainting the American student with the table manners of the educated German middle class. Does the author imply that every member of that class will conform at all times to the ritual there described, and if so, is it his intention to demonstrate the German of today as a modern incarnation of Faust with *zwei Seelen wohnen, ach! in meiner Brust*, deferential and complying in the matter of table manners, but wildly impatient of any restraint imposed upon his speech by the taboos of good linguistic usage?

Schopenhauer once wrote that royalty rights and copyright were the ruin of literature (*Über Schriftstellerei und Stil*, section 1). In the narrower field of *Fachliteratur*, Professor Leo Spitzer of Johns Hopkins put his finger on another sore spot when he expressed the belief "that the requirement of publication on the part of every college teacher—imagine as a parallel that all members of American orchestras were *required* to be composers!—does great harm to true scholarship" (*PMLA*, vol. LXVI, No. 1,

p. 4
text

Der

tu

L

E

I

Helm

Kur

aller

Gua

Rod

Spo

Wen

bunt

Schl

aus

anm

A

diese

U

LEE

E

C

V

si

W

inve

rarel

perv

a cha

W

first

the p

vent

int

prais

tent

upon

a se

empl

B

the c

eral

the

diffe

with

A

"imm

by t

his c

the

diffe

each

p. 45). It certainly does not do any good to the quality of textbooks!

CARL WEITLANNER

D'Youville College

Der lachende Lesering. Ein Handbuch für heitere Stunden. Herausgegeben von Helmuth Leonhardt mit über 600 Zeichnungen. Im Bertelsmann Lesering, Gütersloh, o. J., 415 S.

In seinem schön ausgestattetem Großband bietet Helmuth Leonhardt jung und alt Erzählungen, Anekdoten, Kurzgeschichten, Satiren, Grotesken und Schnarren aus aller Welt. Wilhelm Busch, Heinz Erhardt, Giovanni Guararschi, Christian Morgenstern, Fritz Reuter, Roda Roda, Eugen Roth, Leo Slezak, Heinrich und Alexander Spoerl, Ludwig Thoma, Thaddäus Troll, Mark Twain, Wendelin Überzwerch u.a.m. folgen da einander in einem bunten Reigen, in dem der menschliche Humor der Sachsen, Schlesier und Ostpreußen mit charakteristischen Proben aus Westfalen, Bayern, Schwaben und dem Rheintal anmutig wechselt.

Auch der Deutschunterricht in Amerika dürfte sich diesen Quell des Frohsinns gut gelegen kommen lassen.

J. ALAN PFEFFER

University of Buffalo

LEROY R. SHAW, *Witness of Deceit Gerhart Hauptmann as Critic of Society*. University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 50. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1958. 126 pp.

With attractive clarity the author defines his problem, investigates the evidence, then states his conclusion, only rarely lapsing into such obfuscation as "[human nature's] perversion lies in the quenching of life before it has . . . had a chance to live" (p. 20).

What the reader gets is a competent treatment of the first phase of Hauptmann's career as a writer regarded from the point of view of the contemporary reaction to the conventional cultural lies exposed by Max Nordau. This is an interesting approach to young Hauptmann and is the more praiseworthy as the author is at pains to disclaim the intention of establishing any direct influence of the older upon the younger man. Since Nordau's book did crystallize a segment of the thought of his time, however, it can be employed fairly as a measuring rod for his contemporaries.

Between the nationalistic enthusiasm of the 1880's and the disillusion of Florian Geyer, Hauptmann modified several times his attitude toward man and society, always in the direction of more inwardness and individuality. The tracing of these modifications makes the bulk of the work.

The reference in the first sentence on page one to the "immediate and phenomenal reception" of Hauptmann by the German public at the outset of his career (granting his career as a dramatist is what is meant) strikes me as the most debatable statement in the study. I believe different adjectives would have to be chosen to correspond with the facts of the poet's initial acceptance.

A section of the appendix is devoted to full notes on each chapter, the notes sometimes commendably suggesting

profitable topics for investigation. There is also in the appendix a chronology of Hauptmann's life to 1896, which is not really necessary, and a selected bibliography.

The following need clarification: note 12 of the Introduction is clearly out of place; note 4 of Chapter V gives page reference without the title of the book to be cited. On page 42 "town" should be "down"; and on page 124 the date of Chapiro's book should be 1932. The English adjectival form of "Wilhelm" is surely not "Wilhelminian" as given on pages 12, 85, and 117 (note 9), despite the German "Wilhelminisch." An acute accent is needed in the name "René" on page 126. Finally, what hit Flagman Thiel from a passing train was most likely a wine "bottle" rather than a "flask" (p. 25).

JOHN J. WEISERT

University of Louisville

THOMAS F. MAGNER. *Manual of Scientific Russian*. Minneapolis (426 So. 6th St.), Burgess Publishing Co., 1958. 101 p. (Litho-printed).

This work was begun at the start of the International Geophysical Year and offered to the public after the launching of Sputnik I—an auspicious time for a text on scientific Russian. In his introduction the author notes that he has written the manual "with the hope that its use will enable American scientists to establish scholarly communication with Russian scientists."

A description of the plan of the book follows. Section I is devoted to phonology and grammar. The six pages devoted to the sound system are ample for a book of this purpose. Twenty pages are occupied by grammatical formulations, with examples taken to a large degree from science and technology. This is followed by Section II, containing 13 pages of paradigms. Section III is titled Reference and is intended to serve as a "finder section" for troublesome forms. For example *dno* is listed together with its genitive plural *dona'* and nominative plural *donya*. A list of difficult comparative adverbs is given, and special attention is paid to verbs not easily recognizable from their infinitives (as *mashet* from *maxat'*), participles and the like. An Index of Signals is included to aid the student in coping with the numerous inflections of Russian. Section IV is called "Vocabulary Help" and is devoted to word derivation, connectives, frequently used phrases, as well as a listing of elements for scientists, and one of specialized technical dictionaries. Of extremely great value is Section V, on "Techniques of Translation", which analyzes the main difficulties encountered by American students in translating normal Russian prose.

Only ten pages are devoted to actual sample texts in scientific Russian. These are extracts from journals, books and the now famous "Referaty". The end vocabulary appears to be inclusive and contains adequate indications as to genders, irregularities and verb aspects.

Professor Magner, who is Chairman of the Department of Slavic and Oriental Languages at the University of Minnesota, in this text gives evidence of a great deal of thinking about the problems of presenting Russian to American students. His approach—in which he makes utmost use of his sound knowledge of Slavic linguistics—is

both refreshing and challenging. The main weakness of the text is that, although the grammar is clearly and succinctly explained, not quite enough illustrative examples are given.

The reviewer feels strongly that the author's keen analyses and formulations of Russian structure, and his ability to pinpoint the very phenomena which prove most troublesome to American students, have enabled him to make a unique contribution to the field of Russian methodology. It is in a way too bad that the text purports to deal only with scientific Russian since almost everything (save, perhaps the examples drawn from the fields of science) ought to be eminently usable in any course aimed at the reading objective. As a matter of fact, all Slavists might do well to examine it, with a view to considering similar techniques in texts for other languages of East Europe, particularly those with highly inflected grammatical systems.

A page of additions and corrections is included. In general there appear to be few errata.

The book is usable both as a textbook and a reference manual of Russian structure. As a text it could be completed in about one normal college semester.

JACOB ORNSTEIN

U. S. Dept. of Agriculture
Graduate School

REBECCA A. DOMAR, *Basic Russian*. New York, Photolitho-printed by Cushing—Malloy, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1958, 488 pp. [Price \$5, available at the Book Store, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.]

The brief introduction to *Basic Russian* is devoted to phonetics (pages 9-25) with explanations and examples. This introduction is followed by two grammatical sections. The first consists of 28, the second of 25 lessons. At the beginning of each lesson there is a reading text, usually a dialogue, then Russian words and their meaning in English. The second part of the lesson is grammar with explanations in English. At the end come exercises.

The first part (25-232) deals with the inflection and use of the main parts of speech—of nouns, pronouns, adjectives

and verbs. The second part (232-405) repeats essentials and gives new material, like the comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives, the conditional and subjunctive moods of the Russian verbs and use of participles. The last part (405-483) consists of an Appendix and Russian-English, English-Russian vocabularies.

Part One contains the minimum essentials of Russian, while Part Two introduces more advanced points, with ample review of basic grammar.

In the reviewer's opinion, this grammar is superior to many existing texts in the thoroughness with which it presents and explains Russian fundamentals. Certain points of grammar heretofore considered extremely complicated, are set forth with surprising clarity and simplicity.

Exercises are varied and abundant. Material for exercises includes numerous idiomatic expressions for the students to drill on. Reading portions of the lessons include selections on geography, history, and observations on America and the Americans (for example: p. 343, "We Are Going to California.") Numerous and useful tables and charts are included. The author has put much thought and imagination into preparing the reading selections, many of which are in the form of fast-moving, mature dialogues.

The reviewer feels that in order to teach a foreign language, it is necessary to use a minimum of the students' mother tongue to explain grammar. This opinion is also shared by many in our profession. No less have many teachers and students come to realize that grammar can be interestingly presented, and can even serve as the topic of fruitful and lively discussion.

According to the author each section of the book is intended for one semester of college or one year of high school work. Miss Domar, Instructor in the Department of Slavic Languages of Columbia University, has, done an excellent job in preparing this carefully worked-out text, which members of our profession will no doubt be interested in examining for possible adoption.

It is hoped that in future editions the regular printing process will be used instead of lithoprinting.

EDWARD PETRELEVICH
Edward Petrel's Private School of Foreign Languages
Hackensack, New Jersey

* * *

New Tourist Sights in France

New in view for 1959 tourists to France are: giant highways leading from Paris to the north; an enlarged Orly Airport in Paris; a newly completed convent by Le Corbusier at l'Arbresle in the Rhone Valley; a church in Alsace's Basse-Yutz with a modern stained glass technique developed by Baccarat; new double-decker sightseeing buses in Paris equipped with multilingual earphones; a restored Renaissance masterpiece, the cloister of Saint-Maclou in Rouen; the new UNESCO building and the equally new Palais de la Defense, the world's largest exhibition hall, both in Paris.

* * *